HOUSE OF COMMONS
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES
CANADA

House of Commons Debates

VOLUME 148 • NUMBER 315 • 1st SESSION • 42nd PARLIAMENT

OFFICIAL REPORT
(HANSARD)

Thursday, June 14, 2018
(Part A)

Speaker: The Honourable Geoff Regan

CONTENTS

(Table of Contents appears at back of this issue.)

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Thursday, June 14, 2018

The House met at 10 a.m.

Prayer

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

● (1000)

[*Translation*]

PUBLIC SECTOR INTEGRITY COMMISSIONER

The Speaker: I have the honour to lay upon the table, pursuant to section 38 of the Public Servants Disclosure Protection Act, the report of the Public Service Integrity Commissioner for the fiscal year ended March 31, 2018.

This report is deemed to have been permanently referred to the Standing Committee on Government Operations and Estimates.

* * *

[*English*]

PARLIAMENTARY BUDGET OFFICER

The Speaker: Pursuant to subsection 79.2(2) of the Parliament of Canada Act, it is my duty to present to the House a report from the Parliamentary Budget Officer entitled "2017-18 Report on the Activities of the Office of the Parliamentary Budget Officer".

* * *

[*Translation*]

CONFLICT OF INTEREST AND ETHICS COMMISSIONER

The Speaker: Pursuant to section 28 of the Conflict of Interest Code for Members of the House of Commons, it is my duty to present to the House the report of the Conflict of Interest and Ethics Commissioner on an inquiry in relation to the hon. member for Timmins—James Bay.

* * *

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Mr. Matt DeCourcey (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Minister of Foreign Affairs, and pursuant to Standing Order 32(2), I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the treaty entitled "Statute of the International Renewable Energy Agency" signed in Bonn on January 26, 2009.

An explanatory memorandum is included with the treaty.

* * *

[*English*]

GOVERNMENT RESPONSE TO PETITIONS

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36(8), I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the government's response to 10 petitions.

* * *

● (1005)

[*Translation*]

COMPREHENSIVE AND PROGRESSIVE AGREEMENT FOR TRANS-PACIFIC PARTNERSHIP IMPLEMENTATION ACT

Hon. François-Philippe Champagne (Minister of International Trade, Lib.) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-79, An Act to implement the Comprehensive and Progressive Agreement for Trans-Pacific Partnership between Canada, Australia, Brunei, Chile, Japan, Malaysia, Mexico, New Zealand, Peru, Singapore and Vietnam.

(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed)

* * *

[*English*]

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

INTERNATIONAL TRADE

Hon. Mark Eyking (Sydney—Victoria, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the House is very active this morning on trade. We are a trading nation, and it is good to see the minister tabling his report.

I have the honour to present the 11th report of the Standing Committee on International Trade, "Expanding Trade and Investment with Selected Asia-Pacific Countries: Report on a Fact-Finding Mission to Singapore, Malaysia and Thailand". These are known as the ASEAN countries. We returned from there. It is a huge market, with a fast-growing economy and young people. It is a market we should look at. I am glad that my colleague, the member for Mississauga East—Cooksville, is also here with me to present this report. I would recommend that all members read the report and try to visit these wonderful countries. It is a good way to expand trade and to get along with other countries.

Routine Proceedings

TRANSPORT, INFRASTRUCTURE AND COMMUNITIES

Hon. Judy A. Sgro (Humber River—Black Creek, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the 25th report of the Standing Committee on Transport, Infrastructure and Communities, entitled "Update on Infrastructure".

I want to thank and congratulate all members of the transport committee for their great co-operation and the great work they all did.

[*Translation*]

PROCEDURE AND HOUSE AFFAIRS

Hon. Larry Bagnell (Yukon, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Orders 104 and 114, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the 65th report of the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs regarding the membership of committees of the House.

If the House gives its consent, I intend to move concurrence in the 65th report later today.

[*English*]

STATUS OF WOMEN

Mrs. Karen Vecchio (Elgin—Middlesex—London, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am proud to present, in both official languages, the 12th report of the Standing Committee on the Status of Women, entitled "Women's Economic Security: Securing the Future of Canada's Economy". This is a fantastic opportunity to do the study, with over 42 members of Parliament taking part in this. I would like to thank the member for Sarnia—Lambton, our former chair, who did an exceptional job. I would also like to give special thanks to our clerk, Kenza Gamassi, as well as Clare Annett, Dominique Montpetit, and Laura Munn-Rivard from the parliamentary information and research service. This is a very extensive study, and I believe that all parliamentarians and all Canadians will find some exceptional information on everything from pay equity to child care and what we can do for women when it comes to mentorship.

Ms. Rachael Harder (Lethbridge, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I have the pleasure of tabling the party's dissenting report for the study on economic security completed by the Standing Committee on the Status of Women. As Conservatives, we know that there are many ways to be a successful woman and it is up to each woman herself to choose the path to her success, which is why economic choice is the greatest measure of equality and something that every government should strive for. Women deserve the freedom to work where they choose, be that on the farm, in the office, in the classroom, at home, et cetera. It is the woman's choice, and it is not up to the government to dictate this to her.

Women are strong and capable. They are able to make these decisions for themselves, and they are able to make them in conjunction with their family members. Autonomy must be granted; freedom must be protected; and choice must be respected. This is what women expect from every government, and this one is no exception, despite the fact that the Liberals think they can dictate these things to women in Canada.

The Prime Minister has said that poverty is sexist. In saying this, he has said that poverty disproportionately impacts women and impacts them in a very negative way. Here is the interesting thing. This is the same government that is imposing a carbon tax, and the carbon tax will impact the well-being of women. Let us consider in particular single mothers who are responsible for driving their children to sports practices, dance classes, school, et cetera. These women will now be paying an additional 11¢ per litre on the gasoline that they put in their vehicles in order to go to the places they need to go in order to be good moms. All of this feeds into their ability to economically support themselves and their families.

It is the government that is putting the carbon tax in place. Furthermore, we have asked the government how much the carbon tax is going to cost Canadian families. We would love to know how much it is going to cost a single mom who is working hard to raise her family. The government has hidden that information not only from us on this side of the House, but from all Canadians. Liberals are saying that this is good for Canada, but it is going to ruin lives. It is going to make life less affordable. It is going to prevent people from being able to pay their bills and do the things that are necessary for daily life. The government needs to do more to advance the economic security of women, instead of disadvantaging them.

I agree with the Prime Minister that poverty is sexist, and he is perpetuating it.

● (1010)

[*Translation*]

PROCEDURE AND HOUSE AFFAIRS

Hon. Larry Bagnell (Yukon, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, if the House gives its consent, I move that the 65th report of the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs, presented to the House earlier today, be concurred in.

The Speaker: Does the hon. member have the unanimous consent of the House to move the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Speaker: The House has heard the terms of the motion. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

(Motion agreed to)

* * *

[*English*]

PETITIONS

HUMAN ORGAN TRAFFICKING

Mr. John Brassard (Barrie—Innisfil, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to rise today to present a petition with numerous names on it. There are currently two bills before Parliament proposing to impede the trafficking of human organs obtained without consent or as a result of financial transactions. Bill C-350 in the House of Commons and Bill S-240 in the Senate. It gives me great pleasure to present this petition on behalf of those who signed it.

PENSIONS

Ms. Irene Mathyssen (London—Fanshawe, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I have two petitions to present. The first is in support of Bill C-397, which would amend legislation that denies a spouse the pension of military personnel, members of Parliament, judges, employees, public servants, and RCMP if the marriage took place after age 60.

We know very well that spouses provide care, support, and love even after age 60. The petitioners are calling upon the Government of Canada to support my bill, Bill C-397, which would amend all legislation that denies surviving spouses pensions based on the time of their marriage, because even after 60, we can love.

POSTAL BANKING

Ms. Irene Mathyssen (London—Fanshawe, NDP): Mr. Speaker, nearly two million Canadians desperately need an alternative to the predators at payday lenders' institutions. They charge crippling fees that affect the poor, marginalized, rural, and indigenous communities the most. We have 3,800 Canada Post outlets that already exist in rural and remote areas, where there are few or no banks. These outlets are perfectly capable of conducting financial transactions. The petitioners ask the Government of Canada to enact my motion, Motion No. 166, which would create a committee to study and propose a plan for postal banking under Canada Post Corporation.

The Speaker: I remind the hon. member for London—Fanshawe and others that while presenting petitions we do not present arguments. We present in brief and in a very summary form what the petitioners are seeking.

The hon. member for Oxford.

HUMAN ORGAN TRAFFICKING

Mr. Dave MacKenzie (Oxford, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it gives me pleasure to present this petition. Increasing concerns about international traffic in human organs removed from victims without consent have not yet led to a legal prohibition on Canadians who travel abroad. There are two bills, one before the House and one in the Senate, Bill C-350 and Bill S-240, and the petitioners request that they be passed as soon as possible to prohibit this. The petitioners are from across southwestern Ontario.

THE ENVIRONMENT

Ms. Sheila Malcolmson (Nanaimo—Ladysmith, NDP): Mr. Speaker, at a time of unprecedented global awareness about the problem of marine plastics, and horrifying images of choked whales and snared sea-turtles, petitioners from Nanaimo, Ladysmith, Parksville, and Gabriola Island call on Parliament to support the motion of the New Democrat member for Courtenay—Alberni, Motion No. 151. They call for action on marine plastics, supplementing the citizen action to clean up beaches. Citizens are also calling for change, and specifically calling on the government to regulate use of single-use plastics, as well as provide permanent and ongoing funding to deal with marine debris such as ghost nets, which have been killing fish and marine mammals for decades. We commend the petition to the House.

● (1015)

DISABILITY TAX CREDIT

Mr. Tom Kmiec (Calgary Shepard, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I have five petitions to table, so I will do this as quickly as I can. The first petition is from 26 constituents of mine regarding the Income Tax Act. They are specifically petitioning the House of Commons, reminding it that up to 40% of persons with disabilities do not apply for disability tax credit. They are calling on the House to support Bill C-399, an act to amend the Income Tax Act, disability tax credit. They want to protect diabetics and patients with rare diseases so they are able to apply for the disability tax credit. They want to ensure that they receive the benefits they deserve and are entitled to.

[*Translation*]

HUMAN ORGAN TRAFFICKING

Mr. Tom Kmiec (Calgary Shepard, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the second petition is on Bill C-350, which was introduced in the House.

The petitioners expressly call on Parliament to pass Bill C-350 and Senate Bill S-240. These bills propose to amend the Criminal Code and the Immigration and Refugee Protection Act in order to prohibit Canadians from travelling abroad to acquire organs obtained without consent or as a result of financial transactions, as well as to render any permanent resident or foreign national who has engaged in the heinous practice of human organ trafficking inadmissible to Canada.

This petition has been signed by Canadians across the country.

[*English*]

HUMAN RIGHTS

Mr. Tom Kmiec (Calgary Shepard, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I have another petition here on religious freedoms in Pakistan. It is signed by 529 petitioners. They are reminding the House of Commons of the situation in Pakistan, specifically affecting religious-minority communities, specifically the Sindhi community. The petitioners are asking the government to pressure the Pakistan government to address this issue through legislation safeguarding minority rights and revoking discriminatory laws, and to make Canadian international aid to Pakistan conditional on Pakistan's adherence to the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

CANADA SUMMER JOBS PROGRAM

Mr. Tom Kmiec (Calgary Shepard, CPC): Mr. Speaker, my next petition is on the Canada summer jobs program attestation. It is signed by 30 constituents of mine reminding the House that the Charter of Rights and Freedoms applies to all Canadians and the government has no right to intervene in the way it has done and force people to believe a certain thing over another. The petitioners are calling on the Government of Canada to defend the freedoms of conscience, thought, and belief, and withdraw the attestation requirement for applicants to the Canada summer jobs program.

DISABILITY TAX CREDIT

Mr. Tom Kmiec (Calgary Shepard, CPC): Finally, Mr. Speaker, I present my final petition. Twenty-seven signatories have signed as petitioners from my riding, on Bill C-399. They are asking again for the Government of Canada and all members of the House of Commons to support Bill C-399, an act to amend the Income Tax Act regarding the disability tax credit.

[*Translation*]

GUARANTEED INCOME SUPPLEMENT

Ms. Karine Trudel (Jonquière, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present a petition signed by citizens in the riding of Jonquière concerning the guaranteed income supplement.

As we know, the government recently announced automatic registration for the guaranteed income supplement for all seniors when they turn 64, but we also know that not all seniors will be automatically registered. It is important for low-income seniors who receive old age security to also collect the guaranteed income supplement. That is why I am presenting this petition concerning the guaranteed income supplement on behalf of my constituents in the riding of Jonquière.

[*English*]

KINDER MORGAN PIPELINE

Ms. Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to present two petitions.

One has about 70 signatures from residents exclusively from Salt Spring Island in my riding. They examined the threat posed by the Kinder Morgan expansion. I note this petition was prepared apparently before the decision to buy the pipeline, but the petitioners are calling on the Government of Canada to immediately act to prevent the expansion's moving through British Columbia.

● (1020)

WILD SALMON

Ms. Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP): The second petition, Mr. Speaker, relates to the threat to wild salmon, specifically in British Columbia. The petitioners make reference to the landmark report by Mr. Justice Cohen, the special investigation in 2012 into the catastrophic decline of salmon in British Columbia, particularly the Fraser River sockeye. The petitioners are calling on the House of Commons to act on and immediately implement all 75 recommendations made by Mr. Justice Cohen.

HUMAN ORGAN TRAFFICKING

Mr. Garnett Genuis (Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is an honour for me to table a petition in support of my private member's bill, Bill C-350. It seeks to combat the trafficking in organs without patients' consent. This bill was seconded by a member of the government, the member for Etobicoke Centre, and it was originally proposed in the same form by Irwin Cotler, a previous Liberal justice minister, so it is a bipartisan, multipartisan initiative that seeks to combat this terrible scourge of organ trafficking.

The petitioners also mention Bill S-240, which has already been reported back from committee to the Senate, and I hope we will be able to see that bill here very soon. The petitioners call on the House to pass these bills as soon as possible to work toward the role Canada can play in ending this injustice.

GATINEAU PARK

Mr. Gary Anandasangaree (Scarborough—Rouge Park, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to present a petition from the Canadian Parks and Wilderness Society, Ottawa Valley chapter, asking the federal government to recognize the boundaries of Gatineau Park in Canadian law and pass legislation to ensure its protection for future generations.

SEX SELECTION

Mr. Blaine Calkins (Red Deer—Lacombe, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I have in my hands a petition sent to me by numerous constituents in my riding who are calling on the government to condemn the act of sex-selective abortion.

[*Translation*]

HUMAN ORGAN TRAFFICKING

Hon. Steven Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I wish to present a petition regarding Bill C-350, which was introduced by my colleague from Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan and is supported by the members of the House. The purpose of the bill is to tackle human organ trafficking.

I am happy to see that this bill has the support of the members of the House.

[*English*]

Ms. Rachael Harder (Lethbridge, CPC): Mr. Speaker, like some of my other colleagues here today, I have the pleasure of tabling a petition from residents across Canada who are calling on the government to take seriously the fact that there are many people who are going overseas in order to seek out organs that have been acquired illegally without the permission of the individual from whom they are taken.

There are a number of bills, one in the House of Commons and one in the Senate, that are calling for a stop to this practice and that Canada would condemn it and take action with regard to the individuals who are leaving Canada in order to go abroad to participate in this practice. The individuals who have signed this petition are calling on the House to move very quickly with regard to putting legislation in place to stop this abhorrent practice.

* * *

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the following questions will be answered today: Questions Nos. 1719, 1721, and 1725.

[*Text*]

Question No. 1719—**Mr. Todd Doherty**:

With regard to the new regulations being imposed by the government on the lobster fishery for the 2018 season, which were announced in April 2018 and include the potential closure of wide swaths of fishing grounds: (*a*) did the Department of Fisheries and Oceans conduct any studies on the impact of the new regulations on the New Brunswick lobster fishing industry and, if so, what are the details of any such studies, including (i) who conducted the study, (ii) methodology, (iii) findings, (iv) website location where findings are located; and (*b*) did the Department of Fisheries and Oceans conduct any studies on the impact of the new regulations on the overall New Brunswick economy and, if so, what are the details of any such studies, including, (i) who conducted the study, (ii) methodology, (iii) findings, (iv) website location where findings are located?

Mr. Terry Beech (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Fisheries, Oceans and the Canadian Coast Guard, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, measures were urgently developed over a five-month period due to the unprecedented North Atlantic right whale mortality event that occurred in 2017. They take into account the best available science and input from stakeholders, partners, experts, and indigenous peoples. Closures will reduce fishing effort and could impact communities, but the survival of the species is tied to the long-term economic well-being of Canada's coastal communities. As a result, in-depth economic analysis of the impact of the new management measures on the New Brunswick lobster fishing industry and overall New Brunswick economy did not occur.

The fishing area closed on April 28 in the Gulf of St. Lawrence region could affect up to 200 lobster harvesters and covers approximately 196 km2 or 4.9% of the entire lobster fishing ground in lobster fishing area, LFA, 23C. Each fish harvester has 300 traps. By imposing the closure, there is a potential reduction of up to 60,000 vertical lines in the water in an area where North Atlantic right whale concentration was observed in 2017. Since the season opening, unofficial LFA 23 landings are between 350 pounds per day, for LFA 23 D, and up to 1,000 pounds per day, for LFA 23 A, B, and C, which are typical to above average from previous years. Thus far, the impacts of the closure have been limited.

The targeted fisheries management measures being applied demonstrate Canada's commitment to protecting this species, which is both mandated under the Canadian Species at Risk Act and critical to meeting the new import provisions under the U.S. Marine Mammal Protection Act. Our government will continue to work co-operatively with U.S. counterparts to ensure Canada is able to meet the new U.S. import provisions and avoid any potential impact to the sector with regards to trade.

The current state of the right whale population is extremely concerning and the Government of Canada will continue to work with experts, industry, and environmental groups to develop approaches to reduce risks to whales while limiting negative impacts to fishing communities. DFO is committed to working with industry to explore additional management measures and to develop appropriate systems for fishing gear rope and buoys for future years that will further reduce risks to North Atlantic right whales and protect Canada's vital fisheries sector.

Question No. 1721— **Mr. Kelly McCauley**:

With regard to the Canada 150 hockey rink on Parliament Hill: (*a*) what were the total costs associated with the "Canada 150 Rink" Twitter account; (*b*) how many full-time equivalents managed the rink Twitter account; and (*c*) were the costs associated with the rink Twitter account included in the 8.1 million dollars amount associated with the rink's costs?

Mr. Sean Casey (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the "Canada 150 Rink" Twitter account is exclusively owned and entirely managed by the Ottawa International Hockey Festival. The Department of Canadian Heritage had no involvement in the creation or maintenance of the account.

Question No. 1725—**Mr. Kelly McCauley**:

With regard to costs associated with the Canada Infrastructure Bank to date: (*a*) what are the total costs of managing the Bank, broken down by (i) leases, (ii) salaries of full-time equivalents and corresponding job classifications, (iii) operating expenses; (*b*) how many projects have applied for funding through the Bank; (*c*) of the projects in (*b*), how many have been approved; and (*d*) how many projects assigned through the Bank have begun operations, broken down by region?

Hon. Amarjeet Sohi (Minister of Infrastructure and Communities, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, with regard to costs associated with the Canada Infrastructure Bank, CIB, until March 31, 2018, the total costs of managing the bank are broken out as follows: (i) leases: $ 90,461.35; (ii) salaries of full-time equivalents and corresponding job classifications: $160,170.25, for the job classifications of interim chief investment officer, office manager, and administrative assistant; and (iii) operating expenses: $1,824,457.

With regard to (b) (c) and (d), the CIB continues to engage with stakeholders in the public and private sectors to formulate a pipeline of projects for potential investment. As of March 31, 2018, no project had been approved for investment by the CIB. The CIB's fiscal year end is March 31 and therefore information for the period of April 1 to April 27, 2018 is not currently available.

* * *

[*English*]

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, if the government's response to Questions Nos. 1717, 1718, 1720, 1722 to 1724, and 1726 to 1728 could be made orders for returns, these returns would be tabled immediately.

The Speaker: Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

[*Text*]

Question No. 1717—**Mr. Jamie Schmale**:

With regard to materials prepared for ministerial exempt staff from December 1, 2017, to present: for every briefing document prepared, what is the (i) date on the document, (ii) title or subject matter of the document, (iii) department's internal tracking number, (iv) title of individual for whom the material was prepared, (v) sender?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1718— **Mr. Jamie Schmale**:

With regard to reports of "March madness" expenditures where the government makes purchases before the end of the fiscal year so that departmental funds do not go "unspent", broken down by department agency or other government entity: (*a*) what were the total expenditures during February and March of 2018 on (i) materials and supplies (standard object 07), (ii) acquisition of machinery and equipment, including parts and consumable tools (standard object 09); and (*b*) what are the details of each such expenditure, including (i) vendor, (ii) amount, (iii) date of expenditure, (iv) description of goods or services provided, (v) delivery date, (vi) file number?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1720—**Mr. Kelly McCauley**:

With regard to government advertisements (ads) launched on Facebook since January 1, 2016: (*a*) how many ads have been launched by month and what were the corresponding campaigns for each (ie. employment insurance, citizenship services, tax credits, grants, etc.); (*b*) how long was each ad active for online; (*c*) what were the insights for each ad launched, including (i) how many people were reached by each ad, (ii) what percentage of women and men were reached by each ad, (iii) what were the age group ranges used for each ad, (iv) what were the federal, provincial, or municipal regions targeted by each ad, (v) were specific interests, pages, or likes included in the targeting of the ads, broken down by ad; and (*d*) who in the department or Minister's office receives or has access to the data gathered in the insights of these ads?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1722—**Ms. Candice Bergen**:

With regard to individuals who have crossed the border illegally and are currently being housed in accommodations being paid for, funded, or operated by the government: (*a*) what is the current number of individuals in such accommodations; (*b*) what is the breakdown of (*a*) by city and province; (*c*) what is the list of facilities, such as stadiums or hotels where large groups of individuals (more than 100) are being accommodated; (*d*) for each location in (*c*), what is the number of individuals housed at each location; and (*e*) what is the projected total expenditures on such accommodations for the 2018 calendar year?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1723—**Mr. Alupa A. Clarke**:

With regard to each contracts granted by any department, agency, Crown corporation, or other government entity, since October 26, 2016, to The Gandalf Group or any of its partners, what are: (*a*) the vendors' names; (*b*) the contracts' reference and file numbers; (*c*) the dates of the contracts; (*d*) the descriptions of the services provided; (*e*) the delivery dates; (*f*) the original contracts' values; (*g*) the final contracts' values, if different from the original contracts' values; and (*h*) the details of any research, polling, or advice provided to the government as a result of such contracts?

(Return tabled0

Question No. 1724— **Mr. Alupa A. Clarke**:

With regard to the Canada Revenue Agency: (a) how many individuals have been falsely or accidentally declared deceased by the Agency when they were actually alive, since January 1, 2016; (b) what was the average time between when the CRA declared an individual dead and when the mistake was corrected; and (c) what was the average time it took the CRA to fully pay the lost benefits that it owed individuals who were falsely declared dead by the CRA, from the day that the CRA was first notified of their mistake?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1726—**Mr. Arnold Viersen**:

With regard to expenditures related to accommodations, including operational and other expenses at such locations, for individuals who illegally or irregularly crossed the border: (*a*) what is the total of all expenditures in 2017; and (*b*) what are the details of each expenditure, including (i) vendor, (ii) date, (iii) amount, (iv) description of goods or services provided, (v) file number?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1727—**Mr. Ron Liepert**:

With regard to renovation, redesign and re-furnishing of Ministers' or Deputy Ministers' offices since April 1, 2016: (*a*) what is the total cost of any spending on renovating, redesigning, and re-furnishing for each ministerial office, broken down by (i) total cost, (ii) moving services, (iii) renovating services, (iv) painting, (v) flooring, (vi) furniture, (vii) appliances, (viii) art installation, (ix) all other expenditures; and (*b*) what is the total cost of any spending on renovating, redesigning, and re-furnishing for each Deputy Minister's office, broken down by (i) total cost, (ii) moving services, (iii) renovating services, (iv) painting, (v) flooring, (vi) furniture, (vii) appliances, (viii) art installation, (ix) all other expenditures?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 1728— **Ms. Brigitte Sansoucy**:

With regard to the statement by the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of National Revenue during the adjournment proceedings of April 17, 2018, that "In 2015-16, the EI program received more than 365,000 sickness benefit claims, and paid out over $1.5 billion for this type of benefit. On average, recipients claimed 10 weeks of benefits of the maximum entitlement of 15 weeks. This shows that, in the majority of cases, the available coverage is sufficient": (*a*) how many people applied to use the benefit for each calendar year between 2004 and 2017; (*b*) how many people received the benefit for each calendar year between 2004 and 2017; (*c*) how many people claimed 10 weeks of benefits out of the maximum entitlement of 15 weeks in (i) 2015, (ii) 2016, (iii) 2017; (*d*) how many people claimed 15 weeks of benefits in (i) 2015, (ii) 2016, (iii) 2017; (*e*) how many people claimed 14 weeks of benefits in (i) 2015, (ii) 2016, (iii) 2017; (*f*) how many people claimed 13 weeks of benefits in (i) 2015, (ii) 2016, (iii) 2017; (g) how many people claimed 12 weeks of benefits in (i) 2015, (ii) 2016, (iii) 2017; and (*h*) how many people claimed 11 weeks of benefits in (i) 2015, (ii) 2016, (iii) 2017?

(Return tabled)

[*English*]

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, I would ask that all remaining questions be allowed to stand.

The Speaker: Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

BUSINESS OF SUPPLY

OPPOSITION MOTION—CARBON PRICING

The Speaker: Today, the House will go through the usual procedures to consider and dispose of the supply bill based on the main estimates 2018. In view of recent practices, do hon. members agree that the bill be distributed now?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Carleton, CPC) moved:

That, given the government's failure to provide a clear explanation of the costs of its carbon tax policy, and given that the people of Ontario have rejected the carbon tax, the House call on the government to table, by June 22, 2018, how much the proposed federal carbon tax of $50 per tonne will cost a median Canadian family.

He said: Mr. Speaker, though I speak here and now, and in the present, I want to reach back into our ancient history to discuss our ancient rights and liberties as parliamentary people.

We inherited this place from our British ancestors, who gathered in the fields of Runnymede to force King John to sign the Magna Carta. Among the demands made by what we today would call "citizens" but then were called "subjects" was that the crown could not levy funds for which there had not been provided general consent. In other words, King John and his predecessors had plundered the people in order to fund endless foreign wars and costly ventures, and had done so without the consent of the people actually paying the bills. From that grew a principle that would eventually be called in American terms "no taxation without representation". In other words, the government cannot tax what legislatures do not approve. That principle remains here today.

As members know, governments are banned from levying any tax or in fact making any expenditures before it is approved by this here, a gathering of the commoners. It is not enough for the Senate, which historically represented the aristocracy, to make that approval. It does not represent the common people who pay those costs. We do. We are the representatives of the commoners, and that is why we are here in the House of Commons standing, as we are, on this green carpet representing the fields from which the original commoners came and for whose consent we are the ones delegated to provide.

Before the House of Commons at present is a budget bill that would levy a new tax, a carbon tax. That tax would apply to any good that uses fossil fuels in their production or transport to bring it to consumers. As a result, the tax will raise the cost of almost every consumer good people buy, not only those products that are directly made with fossil fuels but those that are transported or produced by those fuels. Not only will our gas prices, home heating prices, and other fuel costs rise, but our groceries, which come by truck and train, will also become expensive. Consumer goods like furniture and clothing, which also have to be transported to retail outlets, will become more expensive. The government will collect the revenues on those increased costs.

However, unlike other taxes, the costs were not itemized for everyday Canadians. If we pay income tax, we file and we find out what we pay. If we pay HST, we look at our bill and we see how much tax formed part of our purchase price. Therefore, Canadians can generally, if imprecisely, calculate what each tax is costing them. Carbon taxes are far more insidious. Their costs are embedded inside the products and services that people buy but they are not itemized on any receipt. Therefore, if grocers raise the costs of fresh fruits and vegetables to feed our kids, we might assume that they are to blame, when in fact they are not behind the cost increase; rather, it is the government and its carbon tax that is causing that price inflation.

The government is proposing to move forward with this tax to embed all of these price increases in the purchases that Canadians make without telling them what it would cost. One defence it might otherwise have made for this secrecy is that it does not know what it would cost. However, that is not true. I have obtained numerous documents, which I have attempted to table in this House, in which the government has calculated the costs. It says that it has tables in which the costs for the average household is calculated, yet it blacks out the numbers, denying Parliament the information it needs in order to vote on this budget bill.

● (1025)

I spoke earlier about the principle of no taxation without representation. Well, there can be no representation without information. The government cannot tax what Parliament does not approve, but Parliament cannot approve what it does not know. Therefore, there can be no taxation without information.

The government has that information but refuses to release it. Why? What is the motivation for keeping all of this secret? I think it is the same motivation that a high-priced retailer has when trying to sell an excessively expensive product. They do not put the price on a product, but ask that a person bring the item up to the front and make a psychological decision to buy it. Only after, when one has one's credit card out, does one find out what it costs.

My experience is that when I walk through a retail outlet and there is a product that does not have a price tag on it, it is because it is too expensive and I cannot afford it. That may well be why the government is trying to sell the carbon tax without telling people what it will cost them. Even worse, unlike the retailer who at some point prior to the transaction must reveal the cost, in this case, the Liberals do not even propose to reveal the cost after the purchase is made. In other words, people will be paying sums of money to the government without even knowing they are doing it, because those sums are buried in literally millions of products and services that Canadians buy every week and every day.

We, on this side of this House as Her Majesty's loyal opposition, cannot countenance this violation of our ancient right to know what the government costs us. That is why I am announcing today that we have put forward over 200 motions to object to the spending bill the government has just tabled before the House. We will keep the government here voting for as long as 30 hours until it releases every single document it has since the last federal election indicating what this tax will cost the average Canadian family.

I notice that we have a very enthusiastic group of Conservatives here who are prepared to stand and do their duty, to stand and defend taxpayers, to stay here all night if they have to, and stay as long as necessary to defend the people they represent. However, there is no enthusiasm on that side of the House of Commons. I hear nothing but deafening silence, and I see nothing but glum faces. Many of the backbenchers on that side are actually decent and conscientious people, but I am sure members will forgive me for saying that they feel no comfort in watching their privileged front bench cover up the facts from their constituents. I know that they will find it miserable to sit there and vote time after time to protect the secrecy of the front bench as it moves forward with this new, insidious, secretive tax. We know that the Liberals have a majority, but we will use our numbers, such as they are, the strong mandate of the official opposition that we have been given, to make it as difficult as possible for the government to pull off this rip-off.

If members want any proof that this is anything but a tax grab, look at how the Liberals are taxing the tax. They propose to impose the GST not just on products people buy but on the carbon tax cost of those products. Let us say that a Canadian buys some furniture at a furniture store, just like any other middle-class suburban family would do to furnish their home. Of course, the furniture would be subject to a goods and services tax, but there is also another tax hidden within the cost of that furniture, and that is the cost of the carbon tax that has been borne by those who produced the furniture and then transported the furniture.

● (1030)

All of those costs get transferred to the customer. The customer always gets the cost passed down. The government not only proposes that the GST should apply to the furniture but also to the carbon tax cost on that furniture. In other words, it is a tax on a tax.

The Parliamentary Budget Officer says that in the provinces of Alberta and British Columbia alone the federal government will collect a quarter billion dollars in GST on the carbon tax. Imagine what those costs would be right across the country in the form of GST on the carbon tax. Canadians are being forced to pay a tax for the privilege of paying another tax. I asked the government about this and it said this is how the GST works. According to the government, it applies to all the goods and services Canadians buy.

Is the carbon tax a good or a service? I am not sure it is any good except in being of service to the government's plan to take more money from everyday taxpayers. As my friend to the left of me said, it is a disservice to everybody else.

We are calling on the government to release all the documents in its possession. I know the government will try to get out of this voting session tonight by coming up with some phony number that it will invent at the eleventh hour in order to let all of its MPs go home. I want to be very specific about this. We want every single document produced by every single department that calculates the cost of the carbon tax to every single Canadian that has been produced since the last election.

There is no reason why the government cannot do this. We are not looking for commercially sensitive information. What commercial sensitivity could possibly exist in telling people what they are going to have to pay? There is no national security reason the government should not do this, although ironically, the government might go so far as to make an argument for such exemptions. It did use an exemption under an access to information request, that it says in the act that revealing to Canadians the cost of the carbon tax would imperil the government's ability to manage the economy. That was the exemption the government used in the existing Access to Information Act in order to justify withholding information.

Not only will the carbon tax that the Liberals have designed damage the economy, mere knowledge of its cost could be damaging to the government's ability to administer the economy, according to the government. Let us be realistic here. If the carbon tax is going to damage the economy, keeping its cost secret is not going to mitigate those damages. That excuse does not work.

The Liberals say the carbon tax is a provincial policy, that it has nothing to do with them, so they cannot possibly release any information on it. Bill C-74 is a federal government bill introduced in the House of Commons to impose a carbon tax at a national level. If it were simply a provincial issue, we would not need federal legislation, so therefore it is a federal issue.

Then the Liberals say some of these numbers are outdated, that they go back two years. They claim the whole world has changed in two years, so members do not need that crazy old data; they will keep it to themselves. Well, if it is so old, just release it and explain to Canadians why it is not applicable anymore. They should just say the numbers are very high and that they will damage the middle-class Canadian household. They should just tell us that there is no reason to worry because it is old information and it is no longer relevant, that they have new information with which to replace it, and that they will let Canadians look at all those facts and in their wisdom decide who to believe. That objection does not work.

● (1035)

I am very curious to hear throughout the day specific justifications from members of the government for keeping these costs secret. Even those who support a carbon tax should be in favour of telling people what it costs. If it is worth what it costs, then why not provide those costs and justify them in making the case? However, the government will not do that. It wants to keep those costs secret because if the costs become known, then one of the claims the government has made will be disproven. It has claimed that the carbon tax is going to be revenue neutral. To be revenue neutral the government would have to tell people what it is collecting and what people are paying in the first place.

How can we believe the Liberals are going to neutralize a cost if we do not know what that cost is? If they were really going to neutralize the effect on middle- and working-class households of this new tax, they would first need to say, "Here's what it costs and here's what you're getting back in some other tax reduction". However, they will not do that because this is not revenue neutral. The reason we know that is because I specifically asked officials with Environment Canada and Finance Canada at the committee whether the government would use the proceeds of the tax to lower other taxes, in other words to let people keep more through income tax savings in order to compensate them for what extra they pay in carbon taxes. The officials in both those departments confirmed that the government intends to do no such thing. It will not use the revenues to reduce any other tax. In fact, it will use these revenues in order to spend more money. That is the Liberals' definition of revenue neutral. If Canadians send it, they will spend it. Saying they are going to raise a tax, but not to worry, they will spend every penny, is not revenue neutral. It is a tax grab.

We know we cannot trust the government on money. Just yesterday, I stood up in the House of Commons and quoted a Fraser Institute study showing that 81% of middle-class Canadians are paying more income tax today than when the Prime Minister took office. The Prime Minister stood up and said, "That's not what the report said at all. Come on". It turns out he had similar denials on the floor of the House of Commons, and he had so offended the report's authors that they actually took what is perhaps the unprecedented step of asking newspapers to run a guest column where they could correct the Prime Minister and point out that indeed Canadian middle-class taxpayers are paying more because of the policies of the Prime Minister, which is exactly the opposite of what he promised in the last election.

After I disproved his claim about the report, he stood up and said, "Okay, Liberals have raised taxes, but they've just taken away boutique tax credits from rich people". By rich people he means anyone who used the public transit tax credit to take the bus. If someone takes the bus they are too rich for the Prime Minister. He takes a limousine; they take the bus. Taxpayers who used the children's fitness tax credit to put their kids in soccer and hockey are too rich, according to the Prime Minister, and they deserve a tax increase. Students who used the textbook tax credit to buy their expensive books in order to learn are too rich according to the Prime Minister, and according to him they deserve a tax increase. All of this is just a bit rich coming from our trust fund millionaire Prime Minister, who has never once raised taxes on himself.

On this side of the House, we will continue to stand up for working-class taxpayers to give them the chance to earn a better life and keep more of what they earn. We believe in putting people before government, a principle that is 800 years old, a principle that helped inspire the very creation of the parliamentary system in which we operate and debate today, and in which we will stand and vote hour after hour for the rights of taxpayers tonight.

● (1040)

Mrs. Celina Caesar-Chavannes (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of International Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member ended his speech with the phrase "putting people" first. This government has put people first. We have put people first by thinking about their health. We have put people first by thinking about the planet on which we live. That is why we are putting a price on pollution.

In 2015, Canadians paid $39 billion toward pollution. That would cost a family of four $4,300 per year to pay for pollution. We are trying to create a system that not only reduces that and puts a cost on what we do not want, but also ensure we have a healthy environment for our children and our grandchildren.

Also, we are ensuring that businesses are part of a clean economy, a clean tech economy, which is a $23 trillion industry, and reduces pollution. We are putting people first by looking after their health, by looking after future generations, and having businesses being part of a clean growth economy, which will improve the economic situation for a lot of Canadians, putting them first.

● (1045)

Hon. Pierre Poilievre: Mr. Speaker, the member seems to be arguing that the carbon tax is worth the cost. I do not know how she could have concluded that if we do not know the cost. The government will not even tell us how much greenhouse gas will be reduced by this tax, which is its supposed benefit. Therefore, we are supposed to do a cost-benefit analysis without either knowing the cost or the benefit.

It is also interesting that she claims to know the potential market of all these new so-called green industries. She has calculated it to be $23 trillion. I do not know how the government can be capable of calculating something of such an enormous magnitude when it apparently cannot calculate for the House the cost of the carbon tax on the average Canadian family. Why should we believe any of the Liberal numbers if the government will not tell us all of the numbers?

Ms. Sheila Malcolmson (Nanaimo—Ladysmith, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I would like to hear my Conservative colleague's view of the government investing $4.5 billion of public money in the Kinder Morgan pipeline, and the possibility that may even come from Canada pension plan funds, or maybe from the infrastructure bank that the finance minister established. How does that that square with the government's action on climate change?

Hon. Pierre Poilievre: Mr. Speaker, the great Ronald Reagan once said of Liberals and their view on the economy, "If it moves, tax it. If it keeps moving, regulate it. And if it stops moving, subsidize it." That is what we have today: a government that has so weighed down our energy sector with rules, regulations, uncertainty, and taxes, that it is not economical for it to build a pipeline with its own money. Therefore, the government has to build it with other people's money.

We know governments are not particularly good at this. The government paid more money for this pipeline project than anyone in the marketplace was prepared to pay. In other words, it obviously paid more than the market value. The government paid twice as much as the seller said was the book value of the project, and that is just to buy a pipeline that has existed since 1953. The $4.5 billion purchase price does not build a single centimetre of new pipeline capacity. This is a government bailout quickly transforming into a government boondoggle.

Mr. Joël Lightbound (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the member for Carleton this. Back in 2008, he campaigned for a price on carbon pollution through a cap and trade system. It was called "Turning the Corner". The Conservatives soon turned the page on that plan, but it was very important to him back then.

My first question for the member is this. In the 10 years since, what has changed? Is there not more evidence of climate change? Is he denying climate change? Is he denying that we should take action on climate change? What has changed since 2008 to today?

My second question for the member for Carleton is this. We know the Conservatives have a plan; they just cover-up that plan. We would like to know their plan to fight climate change. Now they have taken a different approach than the one they had in 2008. They say that they have a plan, but they do not want to tell Canadians. They do not want to go that far.

Hon. Pierre Poilievre: Mr. Speaker, what has changed is that the proposal of the previous Conservative government did not raise a single penny of revenue for government. That is the difference between an environmental regulation and a tax. Taxes raise money for government. The real motive of the present plan is to raise money for politicians to spend.

This is another thing that has changed. The Liberal government loves to spend other people's money. Since the Liberals took office, they have increased government spending at three times the combined rate of inflation and population growth. Their deficit this year is three times what they promised. Where they have said they would balance the budget in 2019, they now say that will not happen until 2045, a quarter of a century from now.

Those are a bunch of changes.

● (1050)

Mr. Colin Carrie (Oshawa, CPC): Mr. Speaker, this is having a real effect in my community, and I am extremely concerned. My next door neighbour in Oshawa is a GM retiree, as is my neighbour across the street. The uncertainty of this carbon tax, the fact that the government cannot even let Canadians, job creators, and manufacturers know how much it will cost is really making a chill on the market.

Just recently, we heard Mr. Trump follow through on his threat for tariffs on American steel. We use American steel in Oshawa to press parts to build cars. If we put that up 25%, it is just more uncertainty and less competitiveness in Oshawa for us to do what we do best.

Could my colleague comment on why it is so necessary for the government give the cost us of this carbon tax? Even better, it could follow the leadership of the premier designate in Ontario, who said that he would get rid of this carbon tax. At least it could give manufacturers and people with jobs in my community a fighting chance against the American tariffs on Canadian companies and steel companies.

Hon. Pierre Poilievre: Mr. Speaker, the member raises a very good point. The government brings in this tax and drives business out of the country. Then those businesses will move to places where there are no environmental standards or protections and will release even more greenhouse gases in those countries, creating jobs for our competitors.

Climate change is a global issue. It is not enough just to drive business out of Canada, which seems to be the government's plan. If that business establishes itself south of the border, or elsewhere in the world, to continue its productions there because it cannot afford to pay the taxes here, it will still emit greenhouse gases.

We have to tackle the issue of climate change. Having more of our jobs move outside of this country to places with no environmental standards or less environmental standards than we have is no way to tackle climate change.

Ms. Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Carleton's last comments are so reminiscent of the 2011 position of the Conservative Party regarding pipelines. Members of this place may have forgotten, but in 2011, under former prime minister Stephen Harper, the Conservative Party opposed pipelines to British Columbia on the grounds that it would be wrong to export bitumen to countries with refineries that operated under environmental standards not as good as Canada's. That was in 2011, and things have changed and memories are short.

I will defend the government very little on its climate plan. It does not have a plan and had very few promises in the Liberal platform, but one of them was carbon pricing. Therefore, clearly it has public support to bring in carbon pricing. The NDP, the Greens, and the Liberals ran on policies for carbon pricing of different sorts, and that was by far the majority of voters. The Liberals won the majority of seats without the majority of voters. However, on this, the majority of voters are with them to bring in carbon pricing.

Ontario has gone from Kathleen Wynne to Doug Ford, who has said he will pull out of cap and trade. How do we estimate a national price when we do not know what Ontario will do?

Hon. Pierre Poilievre: Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the hon. leader of the Green Party for voting in favour of my private member's bill last week, which would have allowed workers with disabilities to keep more of the wages they would lose to clawbacks and taxes. I know I am not her favourite member of Parliament, so it must not have been easy for her to do that. However, she did it on principle and I thank her for that.

I have to be honest. I agree with Doug Ford that Kathleen Wynne's cap and trade system was an absolute disaster. Of all of the ways to address climate change, this was probably the worst one. It will end up sending billions of dollars to California and other jurisdictions in trading of carbon credits. It will ultimately create a new class of investment bankers and insiders who will make a fortune. The revenues raised by the government itself will disproportionately go to the wealthy and well connected in the form of handouts to businesses and rebates for those who can afford a $150,000-electric Mercedes. It is another massive wealth transfer from the working class to the super rich.

Therefore, I agree with him that we should scrap it. We should work on environmental policies that actually protect our ecology without devastating our economy.

● (1055)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Joël Lightbound (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to speak to the motion moved by the hon. member for Carleton. This gives me the opportunity to talk about what our government is doing to support the economy and protect the environment.

Maintaining a strong economy and fighting climate change are important priorities to us and to Canadians. We share their concerns. With the possible exception of the hon. member for Carleton, Canadians know that there is a cost to pollution. Canadians also know that droughts, floods, and weather have an adverse effect not only on health, but also on the vitality of our economy. A healthy, sustainable economy favours growth and job creation to the benefit of the middle class.

Unlike the previous government, our government does not intend to stand idly by. We have made major investments in order to protect the quality of Canada's air, water, and natural areas. We want to ensure that future generations can still walk in the woods and swim in our magnificent lakes and rivers.

Therefore, to date, our government has allocated $5.7 billion over 12 years in support of the implementation of the pan-Canadian framework on clean growth and climate change. This plan was developed with the provinces and territories and in consultation with indigenous peoples. It will ensure a healthy environment for future generations and support a strong, clean economy. It will also foster innovation and create good, well-paying jobs for the middle class.

Let me remind the House of some of its measures. As a first step in the framework, budget 2016 provided nearly $3 billion over five years to address the effects of climate change and reduce air pollution. In the 2017 budget, the government allocated additional significant investments in green infrastructure and public transit. On top of that, nearly $1.5 billion in new financing was made available to help Canada's clean technology firms grow and expand.

More recently, budget 2018 proposed one of the most significant investments in nature conservation in Canadian history, to protect our ecosystems and biodiversity. In partnership with the provinces, territories, and indigenous peoples, this plan will help preserve 17% of Canada's interior and inland waters. The pan-Canadian framework on clean growth and climate change supports Canada's vision to reduce greenhouse gases by 30% over 2005 levels by 2030, while allowing us to adapt to and build resilience for climate change, which is very real, as we know; its effects are being felt across the country.

To achieve this goal, the key element of our action plan is to put a tax on carbon pollution across the country, because this is effective. It will help us reduce greenhouse gas emissions and to do so at a low cost to businesses and consumers. By focusing on development and new choices to enable Canadians to reduce their carbon footprint, we can stimulate innovation. At the end of the day, we will all benefit from increased economic growth and cleaner growth.

The pan-Canadian framework on clean growth and climate change was developed in collaboration with the provincial and territorial governments, and most provinces support it. A clean environment and a clean economy go hand in hand. That is what we have said and we believe it. Our efforts to tackle climate change are part of our plan to grow the economy and strengthen the middle class. The 2018 budget tabled earlier this year by the Minister of Finance, whom I am fortunate to work with, is doing even more to help Canadians. The new Canada workers benefit will let low-income workers keep more money in their pockets. This will encourage more people to join the labour force and will provide concrete assistance to more than two million Canadians who are working hard to join the middle class.

The Canada child benefit will also be enhanced. Benefits will be increased annually to keep pace with the cost of living starting in July of this year, which is two years earlier than planned.

We are able to do it this year because of Canada's sustained economic growth. By providing more money to families who need it most, this benefit provides a new opportunity for Canadian families. We should also not forget our efforts on behalf of small businesses, who, as we know, create most of the jobs in Canada. We reduced the small business tax to 10% effective January 1 and will be reducing it to 9% next January 1. This represents savings of up to $7,500 a year to help Canadian entrepreneurs and innovators.

● (1100)

[*English*]

The negative impacts of climate change are a challenge that governments must grapple with. We do so with the confidence that a strong economy and a clean environment go hand in hand. Canadians expect all governments to take serious action to grow the economy, protect the environment, and address climate change. We are taking action.

Putting a price on carbon pollution is central to Canada's plan to fight climate change and grow the economy. Carbon pricing is broadly recognized as one of the most effective, transparent, and efficient policy approaches to reducing greenhouse gas emissions.

In December 2016, our government, along with most provinces and territories, worked with indigenous partners and adopted the pan-Canadian framework on clean growth and climate change. The framework includes a pan-Canadian approach to pricing carbon pollution, with the aim of having carbon pricing in place in all provinces and territories. The framework provides provinces and territories with the flexibility to implement their own carbon pollution pricing systems. They can choose between an explicit price-based system or a cap and trade system.

The member for Carleton keeps talking about price hikes. Let me reassure him that the direct cost of the actions in the pan-Canadian framework, including carbon pricing, is projected to be modest, particularly in comparison to the projected benefits. All direct revenues related to carbon pricing will be returned to the jurisdiction of origin. Of course, the precise cost will depend on the design of each provincial or territorial carbon pricing system.

To ensure that a fair price on carbon pollution is in place across Canada, our government has committed to implementing a federal backstop carbon-pollution pricing system. The backstop system would apply in provinces and territories that request it and in jurisdictions that do not have a pricing system in place that meets the federal standard by the end of this year. In such cases, the cost of carbon pollution in the federal backstop system will be set at $20 per tonne of emissions as of January 1, 2019, and the federal system will return direct revenues from the carbon price to the jurisdiction of origin.

That said, we cannot measure the cost of carbon pricing without also measuring its benefits. Those benefits are important, such as reducing air and water pollution and their harmful effects on human health and on the environment.

At the risk of repeating myself, a strong economy and a clean environment go hand in hand. That is why this year's budget proposed further measures to help grow a healthy and sustainable clean economy. For example, budget 2018 includes one of the most significant investments in nature conservation in Canadian history, more than $1.3 billion over five years. This will ensure that future generations can continue to hike in our forests and swim in our lakes and rivers. This will also allow us to enhance the protection of Canada's ecosystems, landscapes, and biodiversity, including species at risk.

Our government is also investing about $1 billion over five years to establish better rules for the review of major projects, an effort that, all at once, aims to protect our environment, rebuild public trust, and help create new jobs and economic opportunities. This builds on the other significant investments made since we took office. For example, budget 2017 included historic investments in green infrastructure and public transit as well as increased support for the Canadian clean-tech sector. Budget 2017 provided up-and-coming companies with increased funding in the form of business equity, working capital, and project funds.

The low carbon economy leadership fund, launched in 2017, is investing $1.4 billion in projects that will generate clean growth and reduce greenhouse gas emissions while creating jobs for Canadians for years to come. In Ontario, where the member for Carleton is from, almost $420 million will be invested to support Ontario's climate change action plan and help Ontarians contribute to fighting climate change.

In Alberta, where the member grew up, and I am sure where he has many friends, almost $150 million will be used to support provincial climate objectives. Alberta's projects will focus on helping Albertans, including farmers and ranchers, use less energy and save money. The province will also invest in restoring forests affected by wildfires.

[*Translation*]

In Quebec, over $260 million will help expand action under the province's 2013-2020 climate change action plan.

● (1105)

[*English*]

The list goes on, with projects in British Columbia, New Brunswick, and Nova Scotia. It is important to note that only provinces and territories that sign on to the pan-Canadian framework for clean growth and climate change are eligible for funding under the low carbon economy leadership fund.

I just spent a bit of time highlighting the measures announced in 2017 and 2018, but this really started in 2016. That year, our government launched a $1.5 billion national oceans protection plan to improve marine safety and responsible shipping, protect Canada's marine environment, and unlock new opportunities for indigenous and coastal communities.

So far, to combat climate change, our government has already allocated $5.7 billion over 12 years in support of the implementation of the pan-Canadian framework on clean growth and climate change. After years of inaction under the previous government, I think members would agree that this has been welcome news for Canadians.

[*Translation*]

Pricing carbon pollution is the cornerstone of our efforts to combat climate change. We must reduce our greenhouse gas emissions and send a clear signal to entrepreneurs, industry, and investors that we are moving to a low-carbon future.

Carbon pricing offers many economic benefits, such as lower health care costs, less spending to fight climate change, and more innovation, including energy efficiency improvements.

Such improvements can be very beneficial. For example, in 2013 alone, energy efficiency savings averaged out to $869 per Canadian household.

In conclusion, a clean environment and a strong economy go hand in hand. The global economy is moving toward cleaner growth. Canada cannot stand on the sidelines.

Our government is determined to ensure that Canadians will benefit from the opportunities created by a sustainable economy and all it offers, including a healthier environment for future generations.

[*English*]

Mr. Colin Carrie (Oshawa, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I know that my colleague, the parliamentary secretary, understands the implications of putting in policies in this country and not mimicking the same policies as our competitors. The challenge we are having right now is that the same people who made Ontario less competitive are now in the PMO, and they are driving this carbon-tax mentality that is going to affect people in my community, not in the future, but very soon, today.

I know that the Prime Minister said he wanted to transition away from manufacturing. He thinks it is bad. He thinks it is dirty. However, there are things we can do to help our manufacturers, particularly in places like Oshawa, with the auto sector, which is facing a real competitive disadvantage right now because of government policy. There are things the government can do to help. We have learned that the Americans are putting in steel tariffs. We build cars with steel. It is a certain type of steel. Unless the Liberals exempt steel coming from the States, there is going to be a 25% increase in costs.

I know that he knows it. Maybe we will find out today. Could the Prime Minister please let Canadians and job creators know how much this carbon tax is going to cost? The decisions the Liberals are making today will affect jobs in the future in communities like mine in Oshawa.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Joël Lightbound: Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague opposite for his question. I enjoy working with him.

With regard to competitiveness and the impact a price on carbon pollution may have, I would like to remind him, even though I know he already knows, that 80% of Canadians live in a province that already has a price on carbon. Those include the most densely populated provinces, namely, Ontario, Quebec, and British Columbia. Their growth is higher than average and they have maintained that growth over the past few years.

Pricing carbon has had no impact on competitiveness. On the contrary, we believe it encourages innovation, and that is supported by empirical evidence. Pricing carbon can have a very positive impact as businesses, industries, and consumers adapt and innovate to reduce their energy consumption and use energy more efficiently. That is not something we can ignore. We cannot only cherry-pick the facts that are most convenient. British Columbia put a price on carbon pollution several years ago and it has been experiencing strong economic growth.

With regard to the steel and aluminum tariffs, I think that we all agree that we need to take a stand against these unacceptable and, in our opinion, illegal tariffs imposed by the American administration. Canada must stand firm in defending its interests and always be calm and reasonable in its dealings with the United States.

● (1110)

Ms. Marjolaine Boutin-Sweet (Hochelaga, NDP): Mr. Speaker, it is clear that putting a price on carbon will have a positive impact on the fight against climate change. I have no doubt about that. However, for as long as oil companies continue to receive fossil fuel subsidies, it will not be enough to meet the terms of the Paris Agreement we signed onto.

I know the government said it intends to phase those subsidies out, but it seems to think it has all the time in the world.

When is the government finally going to end these subsidies?

Mr. Joël Lightbound: Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague and the NDP as a whole for supporting carbon pollution pricing. The vast majority of MPs and Canadians agree that it makes sense and has been shown to be effective in the fight against climate change.

With regard to the fossil fuel subsidies or tax credits, our government is committed to ending them by 2025. Our first budget already included a phase-out of the accelerated capital cost allowance for certain liquefied natural gas facilities. In 2017, we announced the elimination of certain tax credits for oil and gas exploration expenses. All these measures support our objective of phasing out inefficient fossil fuel subsidies by 2025, as promised.

[*English*]

Mr. Tom Kmiec (Calgary Shepard, CPC): Mr. Speaker, as he will note, on the Standing Committee on Finance, members of the opposition moved eight amendments to the BIA specifically on the carbon tax. Every single one was voted down. We were trying to get more transparency in the report to Parliament that would be tabled once a year. We wanted to know the total GHG emissions reductions from the carbon tax. Eight times members of the Liberal caucus voted them down. The member was there, so he would know that this was the case. He talks about transparency and openness, but without that information, Parliament does not have the full picture of what is going on or the impact on middle-class Canadian families.

Why were the members instructed to vote that way? Why can we not have that information? Why do we find ourselves today debating this issue, still not having the full information on the impact on middle-class families, and this carbon tax cover-up?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Joël Lightbound: Mr. Speaker, they did not seem concerned with greenhouse gases for 10 years, but now they are requesting all of the information on reducing emissions, so I am pleased to see that, maybe for the first time ever, Conservative members are worried about greenhouse gas emissions.

If you look at the jurisdictions that do put a price on carbon pollution, you can see that this price does have an impact, that it helps reduce greenhouse gas emissions. Let us wait and see what the provinces will put forward. We will have all of the information once each province develops its plan.

I am pleased to hear that he cares about reducing greenhouse gases. That desire was sorely lacking for the 10 years during which his party stood still as the world was moving towards a cleaner economy. When you stand still and the rest of the world is moving forward, you end up going backwards.

Canadians had had enough of a government that did nothing about climate change and that did nothing to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, after making promises in 2008 in its infamous turning the corner plan, on which it never followed through.

As for the financial impact of putting a price on carbon pollution, it is important to remember that revenue will remain in the jurisdiction in which it was collected. It will be revenue neutral. The provinces will be able to decide what to do with the revenue generated by a price on carbon pollution.

[*English*]

Mrs. Celina Caesar-Chavannes (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of International Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we all know that climate change disproportionately impacts the poorest and most vulnerable, who are often women and children. We know that the weather is getting wetter, warmer, and wilder.

Not only are we trying to reduce pollution, which has an impact on climate change, but we also, as the member mentioned, introduced the Canada child benefit, and indexed it two years earlier; cut taxes on middle-class families; and introduced various measures to support women through budget 2018.

The member for Lethbridge earlier today said that poverty is sexist and that the Prime Minister and our government are perpetuating it. I wonder if the member could correct the record on that and tell this House not only how much our government is doing to reduce the impact of pollution on climate change but what it is doing for Canadian families, especially the most vulnerable.

● (1115)

Mr. Joël Lightbound: Mr. Speaker, it is true that climate change often impacts the most vulnerable among us. By moving away from the boutique tax credits that the Conservatives brought forth as their way of trying to help, which always focused more on the few than the many, the measures we have taken represent a different approach. We want to give more to those who need it the most, such as through the Canada child benefit that the member mentioned.

Just two days ago, when I met with the Alberta Council of Women's Shelters, I was told how big an impact this has had on the people it serves. We have stopped sending the Canada child benefit to the families of millionaires, in order to focus on those who need it the most. We know that the vast majority of those who receive the maximum amount more often than not are single mothers.

This has had a terrific impact, just like the investments we are making into the Canada workers benefit, which will help low-income workers. We are also moving away from the boutique tax credits and the approach the previous government took, where, inevitably, at every corner, it would focus on the wealthiest among us. We think prosperity should be inclusive, and that is the approach we have taken.

When it comes to climate change, the massive investments we are making in public transit, for instance, contribute to quality of life for all Canadians. I can speak for my region, where Quebec City has announced a tramway project so ambitious that it will have an impact on the time it takes for people to get to work, and on the environment with respect to the number of days there is smog in Quebec City. That plan was ambitious because of the federal investments.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Pierre-Luc Dusseault (Sherbrooke, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise today to speak to an important topic in the context of the Conservatives' opposition motion.

I am a bit surprised to have to rise yet again to speak to a question that is very similar to others that have been raised by my Conservative colleagues. Here they are again on the issue of carbon pricing and its cost. It is the famous question that they keep asking over and over again in the House of Commons. It seems that they will never be satisfied with the answers from the government and the interventions by our colleagues in the House.

Today I will address the issue in a broader context and talk about climate change leadership. It is leadership that was completely lacking from the Conservative side. They were content to bury their heads in the sand. As for the Liberals, they are being completely inconsistent when it comes to fighting climate change, especially in light of their recent decisions. I will come back to that later in my speech.

Let me begin by saying that I am disappointed that the Conservatives are so obsessed with this issue that they do not see all the other important issues that we could be discussing in the House. They are obsessed with this topic. They are fixated on a document from October 20, 2015, the day after the election of that same year. The document, to which they keep referring, is some sort of memo or email from the Department of Finance in which the figures are redacted. If the Conservatives seriously want to obtain this document then I do not understand why they have not managed to get their hands on it. That document was dated the day after the election and was highly likely prepared during the 2015 election campaign, when the Conservatives were technically still in power. The Conservatives have developed a baffling fixation with this document.

I am fortunate to sit on the Standing Committee on Finance, where we heard public servants being quizzed about this. They said that the document was prepared during the campaign along with many documents put together in the event that a new government was elected. They worked on several scenarios based on the election platforms of the different parties. It seems that it was common practice in the public service, during and a little after the campaign, to start doing the groundwork for potential changes in government policies and in advance of the swearing in of the prime minister and cabinet. That is what the Conservatives continue to refer to. They are fixated on this document, which is a little surprising given that it was prepared under their watch.

It is also a little surprising to see them so opposed to the polluter pays principle whereby those who pollute have to pay for the cost of that pollution to our environment and our society. In several other areas, paying for one's pollution is standard practice. Our municipal taxes, for instance, pay for our garbage to be taken to the dump. The same principle applies to recycling, because there is a cost associated with taking recyclable materials to a recycling centre. The polluter pays principle applies in most sectors. We pay for the pollution we create.

Until just recently, however, this principle has never applied to greenhouse gas pollution. That is what this government is trying to do, as are the provincial governments and many governments around the world that have already taken action in that regard. It is the right thing to do. As in other areas, whoever is responsible for polluting should have to pay for the cost it imposes on our society. The Conservatives do not seem to understand, nor are they willing to try to understand, that this principle should also apply to polluting our atmosphere.

● (1120)

If this principle is good enough for the garbage we bury in landfills, why should it not also apply to the pollution we put in the air, which goes out into the atmosphere and surely has a significant impact? I do not think we still need to make a case for the existence of and the science behind climate change. Only a few Conservatives still deny the existence of climate change, or more specifically, the fact that human activity affects climate change. Thankfully, their numbers are dwindling.

During the recent campaign in Ontario, we heard Conservative candidates denying that humans had anything to do with climate change. Some of them are in complete denial. Fortunately, a few of them have seen the light with regard to the action that we must take and some others support the polluter pays principle. There are also some Conservative thinkers who have realized that this is the right thing to do. Take for example, Mr. Manning, a well-known Conservative, who has come to realize that a carbon tax is one of the most effective ways to combat climate change. I am also thinking of Canada's Ecofiscal Commission, which did a lot of work on this issue. This commission is made up of a number of thinkers from various backgrounds, including some who are a bit more fiscally conservative. They realized that a carbon tax is the best way to fight climate change.

Based on their studies, they came to the conclusion that, of all the possible tools at their disposal, pricing carbon is the most effective way of meeting our objective of reducing greenhouse gas emissions. The Conservatives alone continue to deny the facts and the studies and findings that have been confirmed by countries around the world.

It is really unfortunate that they are still in denial. Fortunately, leaders around the world have begun implementing polluter pays mechanisms and putting a price on carbon. Take for example British Columbia. It put a price on carbon over 10 years ago. Alberta did the same just recently, and so did Quebec and Ontario. They joined California in implementing a carbon exchange, even though Ontario may end up changing its system. Provinces across Canada have been showing leadership on this issue, and they have had some success.

I do not necessarily want to repeat the Liberal government's words, but we are told that 80% of Canadians are currently subject to a carbon pricing system. We see that these jurisdictions are the most economically successful. This flies in the face of the Conservatives' message and talking points; they say that carbon pricing will spell the end of the economy, that it will catastrophically blow up the Canadian economy, and that as a result, the economy will go into a tailspin. However, Alberta has the highest economic growth, at over 4%, and has also had carbon pricing for a few years now. The economies of British Columbia, Quebec, and Ontario are also doing well.

It is hard to understand why the Conservatives think that there is a cause and effect and that a Canada-wide carbon price will be catastrophic, as well as lead to an economic apocalypse in Canada as soon as it is brought in. This is not supported by any facts, and these are just political talking points for the Conservatives.

● (1125)

This brings me to the importance of the fight against climate change. I am pleased to speak to this issue and say to my constituents that it is extremely important to me. This must be our primary concern here in Ottawa.

In Sherbrooke, hundreds of people constantly write to me on this and other environmental topics. These are very important concerns for us. People are aware of the impact of the climate change that we are seeing across Canada and around the world. They understand that Ottawa must have leaders in the fight against climate change. I am therefore very happy to represent them and to stand up and assure them that this is also very important to me.

It is often said that we must protect the planet for future generations. I still count myself among them to a certain extent, although I am already 27 years old and quite a bit older than when I was first elected. When they say that climate change will affect the youngest, it is because they will have to live with its long-term impacts. I can understand that, and I am certainly worried about my own future on this planet.

We must do everything in our power to slow the impact of climate change, because everyone understands that the process is already under way. We are already seeing the effects, unfortunately, but we have a duty to slow down this process and minimize its impact on future generations and my generation. We want to continue to have a planet where we enjoy living. As my colleague said, we can still swim in our lakes and rivers across Canada, but I fear that this will change in the long term. When I am 80 or 90 years old, if we keep going in the direction we are heading in now, I am not even sure that I will be able to enjoy the same quality of air or water.

That is why I am always happy to share my thoughts on this issue and demand more action from the government. Clearly, doing nothing is not an option, but that still seems to be the Conservatives' preference. They just want to wait, hope, and pray. Some Conservatives pray many times a day, but prayers will not slow the effects of climate change. To do that, we need a real plan.

We must also remember that the cost of inaction is much higher than the cost of action. That is another thing the Conservatives seem to be forgetting here. Yes, there is a cost to taking action, and when the government takes action, it has to get good value for money. An example of that is carbon and pollution pricing, as I was saying off the top. The cost of inaction is much higher, though. The National Round Table on the Environment and the Economy, which the Conservatives shut down in 2011, pegged the cost of inaction at $5 billion per year by 2020 and up to $43 billion per year by 2050. Those costs are much higher than the cost of carbon pricing. The Conservatives seem to have lost sight of that in this discussion.

At the Standing Committee on Finance, the member for Carleton asked the same questions every time, just like he asks the same questions every day in question period. When people talk to him about the cost of inaction, he does not seem to get that such a things exists.

● (1130)

It is truly unfortunate that the Conservatives are so blinded by their ideology. They do not understand that these measures are necessary.

I also want to talk about what various provinces have done, particularly Alberta, which is a real role model in this area. There is the principle of revenue neutrality, which is also part of this government's approach. This means no cost to Canadians. Once again, the Conservatives do not seem to understand. Every time we remind them, either in committee or here in the House, that this will be revenue neutral, they do not seem to understand that every dollar raised by carbon pricing is reinvested directly into the economy. The Conservatives cannot seem to grasp this concept.

Alberta is an excellent example of revenue neutrality, and less fortunate low-income families even have a surplus at the end of the year. They receive more money than they pay for carbon pricing. These figures are obviously put forward by the Alberta government. I do not have the exact numbers in front of me today, but costs are estimated at around $400 for each low-income family.

Furthermore, these are the families least affected by the carbon tax because they consume the least. The tax is estimated at $400 per family, but the Government of Alberta gave out direct rebates of about $500. They came out on top at the end of the year. I used the past tense, but I should also use the present. They come out on top at the end of the year. This system is still in place in Alberta. An important part of the discussion should be that the money from the carbon tax is directly invested into the provinces or given directly to citizens through direct transfers.

This brings me to the Liberals' inconsistent approach to the environment, even though today we are talking about the carbon tax and we support this initiative, as we said earlier. All of the major political parties, except one, promised some kind of carbon tax in the last election. I must commend the Liberals on their initiative. However, I condemn their inconsistent approach to combatting climate change.

Everyone, including the people of Sherbrooke, saw what happened recently. We were outraged by the government's decision to invest $4.5 billion of our money in a pipeline transporting oil sands to British Columbia, in spite of obvious opposition in several regions of British Columbia, including indigenous reserves.

The government decided to take money from the people of Sherbrooke, who pay their taxes every year and every day. It decided to take taxpayers' money to invest in a 70-year old pipeline that leaks. Just recently that pipeline leaked 5,000 litres of oil. I want to use the very apt analogy that my colleague from Rosemont—La Petite-Patrie used yesterday, I believe. He said it is as though the government decided in 1990 to invest in the VHS industry, which was obviously doomed to sputter, if not fail, with the arrival of new technologies.

In this case, the government is deciding, with a glaring lack of long-term vision, to take taxpayers' money and invest it in the energy of yesterday, specifically in a pipeline and even a pipeline expansion. The government is going to inject an additional $12 billion to $15 billion of public money into the expansion of this pipeline in order to transport even more oil.

This is completely inconsistent with the current narrative of the Liberals, who signed the Paris Agreement and say they want to fight climate change. They then turn around and take our money to invest it in a pipeline, an extremely bad deal for Canadians. No private investor was prepared to invest money in this project, and the company that owned the pipeline could not find a buyer.

● (1135)

How can the government claim that this is good for Canadians when the Prime Minister was the only person willing to kick in? This project certainly conveys no vision for our country's future. I just wanted to make sure I condemned that in my speech today. We are talking about climate change and greenhouse gas reduction measures, but we have a government that is inconsistent, to say the least. It says it wants to fight climate change, but then it turns around and spends an eye-watering $4.5 billion on this pipeline. That is an astronomical sum. What could we do with $4.5 billion? The opportunities that could be created with $4.5 billion would be amazing, especially if invested in an energy transition. However, the government has chosen to spend it on a project that is utterly devoid of any vision for the future and is doomed to fail, given that no private investor was willing to risk a penny on it.

I would be happy to take questions from my colleagues to elaborate further on the points I addressed today.

[*English*]

Mr. John Barlow (Foothills, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I appreciated the intervention from my colleague from Sherbrooke, but for a great deal of his speech he talked about the template that Alberta should be using for its climate change plan.

I do not know if my colleague has been to Alberta and has seen the impact that the NDP's policies have had on its economy. There are some issues with the member's argument. He supports the NDP climate change plan but a big portion of that plan was to get the social licence to build pipelines. We have not had a pipeline built despite having a punitive carbon tax on everyday Albertans. He also commented on how much he opposes the pipeline. There are some diametrical issues there.

Alberta has had a carbon tax for decades. It was initially put on the largest emitters. The funds from that carbon tax were not charged to regular Albertans but were charged to the largest emitters who are using those funds to invest in renewable projects like Enbridge's Blackspring wind farm. The carbon footprint of a barrel of oil is down to a third of what it was decades ago because of that carbon tax on the largest emitters. The member said that, now, with the provincial NDP government, those funds from the carbon tax are being reinvested in the economy. Actually, for the last two provincial budgets, the carbon tax was put into general revenue to try to balance the budget.

The member said that the carbon tax should be reinvested in the economy or given back to Albertans, but the provincial NDP government has now said that the carbon tax is being put into general revenue to try to balance its budget. Is that something he would agree with?

● (1140)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Pierre-Luc Dusseault: Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for his intervention and for pointing out that Alberta instituted carbon pricing long before the NDP formed government. It was actually implemented by a Conservative government.

I want to reiterate that I absolutely agree with the idea of revenue neutrality. This would mean that any carbon pricing revenue collected by the government would have to be fully reinvested, either by giving rebates directly to residents of the province or territory or by injecting it into the economy to make an energy transition. That is what I would hope for from any government that opts for a carbon tax. It needs to be part of a long-term strategy leading to a decision to use this revenue to make an energy transition and reduce greenhouse gas emissions, unlike what we have been seeing over the past decades.

My hope is that, in the future, there will be no need for a carbon tax because we will have moved to a carbon-free economy. Obviously, that is a long-term goal, but I hope that we reinvest so much money from the carbon tax into the energy and the economy of the future, that the carbon tax will become a thing of the past and the revenue it generates will gradually fall as our economy reduces its reliance on fossil fuels as much as possible.

[*English*]

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to reflect on the province of Alberta, because there is a lot we can learn from it. I believe it was the first government in North America that determined that it was necessary to put a price on pollution. That was a Progressive Conservative government that made that determination. There have been other Conservative leaders, such as Preston Manning and so forth, who have recognized that.

As opposed to reading too much into why the Conservatives are trying to promote what I would classify as untruths on the facts related to what is actually taking place today, let us look at the province of Alberta. In Alberta, the NDP government recognized the value of the environment and the economy working together. On the one hand, we see that there is concern about emissions and a price on pollution, and on the other hand, we see the value of a pipeline. The NDP premier has said that we need to be able to move forward on both.

Would my colleague not agree that Rachel Notley's approach, which is very similar, if not identical, to the approach of this government of having the environment and the economy working hand in hand, allows all Canadians to directly benefit from dealing with the environment and dealing with a price on pollution?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Pierre-Luc Dusseault: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my colleague's question. Sometimes I get the impression that the Liberals do not understand that the NDP believes that the economy and the environment go hand in hand. We are saying the same thing, but the Liberals do not want to acknowledge it.

Just on Tuesday, we debated an opposition motion that clearly set out our vison for the economy of the future, namely, an economy that protects the environment. The two go hand in hand. We cannot have an economy that kills the environment. There would be no more economic activity if the quality of the environment deteriorated to the point where it was difficult to live on this planet. That is why I sometimes have a hard time understanding why the Liberals are accusing us of seeing only one side of the story. The environment is extremely important, but the economy of the future will enable us to protect it. My colleague was right in reminding members that Alberta is a good example of investing in the economy of the future.

However, what I have a hard time understanding is how the Liberal government decided to invest in a pipeline, because that certainly has nothing to do with the economy of the future. If the Liberals want to say that the economy and the environment go hand in hand, they cannot invest in a pipeline in 2018. I do not think that is a good choice for protecting the environment and growing the economy.

● (1145)

[*English*]

Mr. Don Davies (Vancouver Kingsway, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the Liberals keep repeating over and over that the economy and the environment go hand in hand. Everyone in the House agrees with that and knows that. What Canadians really want to know is how the Liberals rationalize what is apparent to everyone as a clear contradiction: they cannot triple a pipeline, triple the export of raw bitumen, expand fossil fuel infrastructure, and reduce carbon emissions at the same time. The Liberals say that they can do that. It is like saying that we want to reduce gambling by building more casinos. It just does not make sense to Canadians. It does not make sense as a matter of logic.

If they are going to expand the pipeline and triple the export of raw bitumen and put that much more carbon in the air, they have to reduce emissions elsewhere to not only meet that but to actually go below that if we are going to reduce our carbon emissions, as we committed to in Paris under the Paris climate accord.

I am wondering if my hon. colleague has ever seen any math from the Liberals that show where they intend to make other cuts in Canada's carbon emissions such that we can actually meet our commitments and do what we can to avoid that terribly serious 2°C rise in temperature, which will cause catastrophic climate change, not only in the future but now, when we are experiencing floods and forest fires all over the country.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Pierre-Luc Dusseault: Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for his excellent question.

That is actually a significant gap in the Liberal strategy. The government signed the Paris Accord, but to date it has said nothing about how it will reach its targets, not to mention that it decided to triple the production or export capacity of a pipeline. I would like to see the numbers to show otherwise, but the government never proved that it took into account the increase in greenhouse gas emissions and that it would offset this increase with reductions in other sectors it had presumably targeted. Unfortunately, there is no transparency on that.

The government is moving forward blindly, making piecemeal decisions willy-nilly, and it does not seem to have a comprehensive strategy. A broader framework would perhaps allow us to discern that we are increasing these emissions in one sector but decreasing them in another, and that in the end we will reach our greenhouse gas reduction targets.

My colleague mentioned another discrepancy or inconsistency that is truly incredible. The Liberal government continues to believe that, like any other product, oil and raw products can be exported to other markets, processed there, and then returned to Canada for consumption, and that this is a credible strategy.

Once again, the government has shown a complete lack of vision by failing to ensure our goods and natural resources are value-added.

[*English*]

Mr. John Barlow (Foothills, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to rise today to speak to our opposition day motion asking the Liberals to come clean on the carbon tax cover-up and tell Canadians exactly what the carbon tax is going to be costing Canadians.

I will be splitting my time with my colleague, the hon. member for Prince Albert.

The carbon tax and the issue we are facing now is part of a much larger narrative we are hearing from the Liberal government. We have heard it for several months, if not a couple of years now. It is the Liberals imposing these ideological policies without doing their due diligence and without having any understanding of the consequences of these decisions for everyday Canadians. They do not seem to do the fiscal analysis. They do not seem to do their homework and understand the consequences of their decisions on certain sectors of the economy.

I would like to bring forward one example. That example is something that is obviously important to me in my riding of Foothills, and that is the impact of the carbon tax on agriculture. The Minister of Agriculture, a couple of weeks ago, in our agriculture and agri-food committee, as well as in the Senate, claimed that Canadian farmers are very supportive of the Liberal's carbon tax. I have not spoken to one single farmer who has phoned me or sent me an email who supports the Liberal carbon tax. In fact, it is quite the opposite. They are extremely concerned about the impact the Liberal carbon tax will have on their farms. It is a farm-killing carbon tax.

I would like to quote a couple of prominent people from the industry. The chair of the Western Canadian Wheat Growers Association said, "I'm not sure who has been briefing [the agriculture minister], but he is dead wrong if he thinks that most farmers support the carbon tax".

The president of the Western Canadian Wheat Growers Association said, "Farmers don't agree on everything, but if there's one issue they stand together on, it's in opposition to a carbon tax."

It appears that the agriculture minister is misrepresenting the view of Canadian farmers when it comes to the carbon tax. All we are asking the minister is how much the carbon tax is going to be impacting our Canadian farmers, yet the Liberals will not do that. They will not come clean with those numbers.

Farmers, ranchers, and ag processors are dependent on any constant they can have in their industry. Unlike any other sector, our farmers and ranchers face so many unknowns, whether commodity prices, weather, or trade agreements, and the Liberals are adding yet another piece of uncertainty to their livelihoods. The carbon tax is just another attack on rural Canadians, specifically on agriculture.

Let us take a look at some of the things our farmers and ranchers have had to face over the last couple of years with the Liberal government. There is front-of-pack labelling. This is going to be devastating to Canadian agriculture, and the government has absolutely refused to listen to our stakeholders. In fact, it has gone out of its way to ensure that they are not included in the debate on front-of-pack labelling.

The same can be said of Canada's food guide. The government is once again pushing ideological ideas, telling Canadians, according to another Liberal values test, what is healthy and what they should be eating. They are telling them to stay away from meat protein and dairy products, because those things are unhealthy. There is no common sense to that.

That is just the beginning. There is the bungling of trade agreements. We are losing a lot of our pulse export opportunities in India, one of our major trading partners. It is a $4-billion industry that is now in jeopardy because the Liberals have bungled our relationship with India.

Now we see that NAFTA is at a critical stage. We have finally seen the TPP tabled today, but will we ratify it so that we are one of the first six countries to take advantage of those new market opportunities? We have also heard that for our producers, their entrepreneurial spirit is being crushed by no longer being eligible for the small business tax deduction. All these things are making it more and more difficult for our agriculture sector and our farmers and ranchers to be successful, to reach those new markets, and to stay in business. It seems to be on every tool they have to be successful and wake up in the morning and go to work. It takes away their feeling that they are worthwhile and that what they are doing is appreciated by Canadians. That is why they are finding this to be most frustrating.

● (1150)

The Conservative are trying to fight for the taxpayer. We want to know what the implication of this will be for our constituents. At the agriculture and agri-food committee, we asked several times for a study on the carbon tax and the impact it would have on agriculture. Every time we asked, we were blocked by the Liberal members.

Farmers have earned the right to know how a Liberal policy will impact their everyday lives. It will impact their livelihood. Is this something they want to pass on to their sons, daughters, nieces, and nephews? Many of our farmers have been on the land for generations.

The other thing the Liberal carbon tax does not take into consideration is the environmental stewardship and the work our farmers have been doing for years to try to protect the land, aquifers, and waterways, which are so important to them. They use zero tillage, new methods and innovation to be on the land much less than they were, and are growing higher yields on less land. They have been doing all these things on their own, without having a carbon tax imposed on them. These things should be taken into consideration, but they are not. In fact, it has gone the other way. The government is going to impose yet another obstacle for our agriculture industry to be successful.

Earlier this morning my colleague talked about taxation without representation. This is yet another example of the Liberals moving ahead with an ideological policy but not having the confidence to take those decisions to Canadians. They do not have the confidence to open it up and put it on the table. The Liberals campaigned in 2015 about being open and transparent and doing things differently. They have had opportunities to come clean on the cost of this. We know from the Parliamentary Budget Officer and the Department of Finance that the carbon tax will be more detrimental to rural Canadians, and even more detrimental to western farmers as opposed to eastern Canadian farmers. We know those numbers. Therefore, why will the Liberals not come clean and just say what it will cost and the impact it will have on the agricultural sector?

The Liberals keep talking about the importance of agriculture to our economy. They have set this goal of reaching $75 billion in exports by 2025. It is great to have those aspirational goals, but if, at the same time, they are cutting the legs out from under the agricultural sector, taking away every tool farmers have to try and reach that goal, then they are being disingenuous to our Canadian farmers.

Previously, I talked about taxation without representation. However, another tax that will have a profound impact on our farmers is the escalator tax. The Liberals have put forward an unprecedented escalator tax that will increase the cost of beer, wine, and spirits every year, and it will not have to go through the scrutiny of Parliament. Canadians will not have a voice or an opportunity to speak their minds on a tax increase that will come forward every year. That will impact our agriculture sector. We have barley and rye growers, and producers out there, certainly in the wine industry, who are very excited about the new opportunities with craft distilling and craft beer. They will pay the escalator tax over and over again, and now also for a carbon tax.

I do not think we are asking the Liberal government anything unwarranted. We asking it to be open, transparent, and honest with Canadians. What is the carbon tax going to cost our Canadian farmers and ranchers? They are up every day, putting in their blood, sweat, and tears to ensure we have the best quality food on our table and doing everything they can to feed the world. However, for every opportunity they have had, the Liberals have made it more and more difficult.

I will conclude with a question for the Liberal government. What is its farm-killing carbon tax going to cost Canadian farm families?

● (1155)

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the only aspect of the member's speech that I would concur with is the fact that we have outstanding farmers in Canada. I am very proud of the industry in my home province of Manitoba. The member made reference to zero tillage. There are so many fantastic examples of why Canada has the best farmers in the world. That is about where I fall offside with what my colleague has said.

The Conservatives are trying to create this great myth. Whether it is true or not, it does not matter. They have a narrative and they want to sell that narrative. It is as if they are the ones who want to give tax breaks to Canadians. When we brought in the tax break for Canada's middle class, the Conservatives voted against it. That is the reality.

Now they want to talk about the myth of putting a price on pollution as if it is a bad thing. Eighty per cent of Canadians already have a price on pollution in place. However, the Conservatives do not want that fact to confuse their narrative.

Earlier the member from the Conservative Party said that the Conservatives would insist on getting answers on the costs. Has the member obtained those costs from different provinces? After all, the provinces will be responsible for administering for this.

● (1200)

Mr. John Barlow: Mr. Speaker, I find it almost humorous that the member talks about Conservatives putting out this myth. The myth is what the carbon tax will cost Canadians. If he does not want to talk about myths, then he should come clean and tell us what this will cost.

The government knows the numbers. We have the seen the document, but it has been redacted. The government will not come clean. The member is talking about these myths, but the Liberals are the ones who are covering this up. We are trying to find out what the cost is.

Once again the Liberals are very good at making a mess of policy, but then just throwing it to the provinces to make the decisions for them. The member says that 80% of Canadians already live in a jurisdiction with a carbon tax. That will be very different, very soon, with the change in government in Ontario. It will not be 80% anymore. A year from now, when the NDP is out of Alberta, it will not even be close to 80%.

We are seeing a trend. Canadians have started to understand the implication of what a carbon tax is. It is just a tax grab by Liberal and NDP governments that does absolutely nothing to address greenhouse gas emissions or climate change, or any of these things. It is a revenue generator for NDP and Liberal governments.

Mr. Don Davies (Vancouver Kingsway, NDP): Madam Speaker, the hon. member made some references to front-of-package labelling. I am fortunate to be the critic for health for the New Democratic Party. We have taken a look at this.

As my hon. colleague might well know, we have quite a serious child obesity problem in the country. It is, in fact, a diabetes pandemic, as it has been described. Part of the problem has to do with our eating patterns. It has been suggested that if we can give consumers more information on the front of packages, particularly about sugar content, sodium content, and fat content, it would help Canadians better understand what they are eating, helping them live healthier lives.

Is the member in favour of giving consumers better and more accurate information on the front of packages or is he opposed to that?

Mr. John Barlow: Madam Speaker, I am absolutely in favour of Canadians making well-informed decisions when it comes to their food choices. What I am not in favour of is a Liberal government imposing a values test on the food we choose. When it comes to front-of-pack labelling, I want them to be based on good science. I have letters from literally hundreds of health experts and doctors who say that the direction the government is going with front-of-pack labelling is wrong. It is not based on good science. It is not based on common sense.

How can it be common sense when the government is going to put a warning label on plain yogurt, saying that it is unhealthy, and not doing the same on a can of diet cola? When we are talking about obesity and diabetes, where is the common sense in this, that a bag of potato chips will not have a warning sign on it, but a glass of 100% fruit juice will have a front-of-pack warning on it? If it is based on good science, then I could support that.

* * *

POINTS OF ORDER

DRAFT APPROPRIATION BILL—MAIN ESTIMATES, 2018-19

Mr. Kelly McCauley (Edmonton West, CPC): Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Earlier today the draft appropriation bill was circulated. I want to draw the House's attention to schedule 1, vote 40 for the Treasury Board Secretariat. The language used for vote 40 differs substantially from the language used in the estimates document. The estimates describe vote 40 as follows:

"Budget implementation $7,040,392,000"

Authority granted to the Treasury Board to supplement, in support of initiatives announced in the Budget of February 27, 2018, any appropriation for the fiscal year, including to allow for the provision of new grants or for any increase to the amount of a grant that is listed in any of the Estimates for the fiscal year, as long as the expenditures made possible are not otherwise provided for and are within the legal mandates of the departments or other organizations for which they are made

This is the language deemed to have been adopted and reported to the House by the government operations and estimates committee. The schedule description in the draft supply bill would confer different authority on the government, none of it approved or deemed to have been approved by the House. In short, the government is seeking new authority for unknown, unspecified spending of public monies without telling Parliament. It is creating what is commonly known as a slush fund by seeking to make expenditures based on the budget document rather than the estimates document, which carries the constitutionally significant recommendation of the Governor General.

I refer the Speaker to sections 53 and 54 of the Constitution Act, 1867, Standing Orders 79 and 80, chapter 18 of the third edition of *House of Commons Procedure and Practice*, and Sessional Paper No. 8520-421-181, which was transmitted to the House on April 16 in the form of a message from Her Excellency the Governor General, signed by her own hand. These are the main estimates.

Let me draw everyone's attention to page 883 of *House of Commons Procedure and Practice*, which states, "Concurrence in the estimates or in interim supply is an order of the House to bring in an appropriation bill or bills giving effect to the spending authority (amounts and destinations) that the House has approved." I emphasize, "that the House has approved". It continues, "Supply bills must be based on the estimates or interim supply as concurred in by the House." Again I emphasize, "as concurred in by the House". The same language appears in the first and second editions.

Table A2.11 originated in the finance minister's budget. It is not contained in the estimates, is not part of the recommendations of the Governor General, has not been considered or concurred in by any committee, has not been concurred in by the House. Nor has any committee reported to the House to advocate that it be included in the supply bill.

It is not open to the government to create, delete, or alter the authority and purposes of the appropriation bill by inventing new language in this schedule, which alters the decisions of the House as expressed when it has concurred in the estimates contained in Sessional Paper No. 8520-421-181. The government is not entitled to rewrite the estimates in ways that amend the decisions of the House.

Let me conclude with a word of caution to the House, particularly in light of the present-day political conditions in the Senate.

Citation 619 of the sixth edition of Beauchesne's states:

> The legal right of the Senate, as a co-ordinate branch of the Legislature, to withhold their assent from any bill whatsoever is unquestionable. They may refuse to pass any bill, including money bills. Therefore the House should be cautious that a Supply Bill contains nothing extraneous so that the Senate will not depart from its normal practice of passing such bills as a matter of course.

● (1205)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): I will certainly take the information under advisement and will come back to the House.

Resuming debate, the hon. member for Prince Albert.

* * *

BUSINESS OF SUPPLY

OPPOSITION MOTION—CARBON PRICING

The House resumed consideration of the motion.

Mr. Randy Hoback (Prince Albert, CPC): Madam Speaker, I guess we just heard about another cover-up that the government is involved with. I am sure everyone is as shocked as I am. The government just cannot seem to do things out in the open and do things in a transparent manner, or in an informed manner, in order to move forward.

An hon. member: Sunny ways.

Mr. Randy Hoback: Yes, Madam Speaker, that is sunny ways, and that is how we see things.

The economy and the environment have to go hand in hand. Let us change it around. The environment and the economy must go hand in hand. We have heard this over and over again in the House. It is actually true. It is something that former Prime Minister Harper used to say too, the economy and the environment go hand in hand. It has to be balanced. He also would say, though, that as things are done on the environment file, other countries must take on their responsibilities as well. It cannot be done alone or in a vacuum.

I think that Ontario found that out the hard way when it proceeded down the road that they went on, with green power, solar power, and wind power. It ended up driving every business out of Ontario, or any new investment out of Ontario maybe would be a more accurate phrase.

I am really looking forward to a new Conservative government here in Ontario that is actually going to bring back some competitiveness into the business sector in Ontario so that Ontario's businesses can compete.

A carbon tax in Saskatchewan will not happen. It is Saskatchewan's jurisdiction to put on a tax. A member across the aisle just asked a question to the member for Foothills about seeking the advice of the provincial governments for their analysis on the carbon tax, because he has admitted it was their domain. He is right. It is Saskatchewan's domain as to whether or not it decides to put on a carbon tax, and it knows that would be a bad decision.

That does not mean that Saskatchewan is not being responsible about the environment. It presented a plan to the federal government that would allow them to meet all their environmental requirements, emissions requirements, and be progressive without a carbon tax. One would think the environment minister would say that is great, that she is excited for Saskatchewan, and proud of it. However, what did she do? In the last budget she put $104 million in the budget for carbon costs. Wait a minute. This is supposed to be revenue neutral. Where is the $104 million coming from? There goes revenue neutral.

That just shows the reality of what the government is doing with the carbon tax. It is a way for it to tax people. It is a way for it to pick winners and losers in the economy as it sees fit. It is a way for the government to put its fingers where they do not belong.

In Saskatchewan we have been concerned about the environment for years, long before "environmental protection" and "environmental assessment" or "taking care of the environment" were the cool words being expressed by the environment minister here today, this week, or the last couple of years. I can think back to "no till". Saskatchewan embraced no till. It is actually good for the soil, good for the water, and good for the environment. Farmers grabbed that technology and said, yes, this makes sense. The other thing that happened with no till was that it was economical. It made sense economically for them to do that. That is why it was embraced. This is a classic example of the economy and the environment going hand in hand. If we look at things in the economy that actually improve the environment, no till is a classic example. Direct seed is another classic example.

We should not kid ourselves. There were lots of challenges starting down that path, and lots of issues with weed management, crop rotations, and soil degradation. All of those things have to be figured out and managed, but the will and the spirit of the farmers of Canada, and in western Canada, can overcome that. Now if we look at the Prairies, and they end up with a summer with four or five inches of rain, they would still get a crop. However, back in the 1970s if they ended up with just four inches of rain, it would be a dust bowl. That is the advantage that Saskatchewan and the farmers in western Canada and Ontario have by taking care of the environment, and also by having a good economic future.

When we look at the carbon tax, it does not do that. If a farmer in western Canada has a carbon tax, he or she is less competitive than all other farmers in the world. We take the world price. The price for wheat is set in Minneapolis or Chicago, as are the prices for soybeans and canola. Everything is interrelated. When I have a carbon tax I cannot pass that cost on. I am not a manufacturer. I am a farmer. I take the market price based on the global supply and demand, so when I have to pay that cost it comes off my bottom line.

● (1210)

What does that mean to me and my operation? That means profits come out of my operation that normally would have gone to reinvesting in my farm to make it even more environmentally friendly and more economical, investing in new technologies and new machinery that would actually reduce my greenhouse gases even more. However, because I am sending it to Ottawa I cannot do that. Does that make sense?

There are so many things about the carbon tax that Canadians have to get their heads around, which the Liberals have not gotten their heads around.

We have manufacturing facilities and we have steel plants that are the most green and efficient in the world, yet because of the carbon tax they are shutting down. What will be replacing them? Those products still are required by Canadians and people around the world. The products that will be replacing them are from plants in other jurisdictions that do not have the same environmental regulations, that do not have the same requirements to labour codes and safety. The products are coming from India and China and places like that, which our Canadian companies cannot compete with because they have a carbon tax.

Have Liberals helped the environment when they shut down Canadian companies so that companies in China can just build more product as they see fit without any concern for the environment? No, they have done the opposite. They have not only put Canadians out of work; they have actually done more harm to the environment. There must be a better scheme to hit the emissions targets than a carbon tax, and that message has been repeated over and over again to that deaf group on the opposite side.

We have to step back and ask what they are doing this for. Why is this moving forward? Why would they want this? They have all this evidence to show them that the carbon tax does not work. Australia tried it and backed away from it and ended it. France was going to do it, but the French did their analysis and then said they were not going to do it. That is why we are asking the government to do its analysis and make it public because it might look at it and say this is stupid and we had better not do it. I think the reality is that they have looked at the numbers and said this is stupid but we are still going to do it.

What do we do? How do we help them? There are so many examples in the current government where the Liberals have done things where we tried to help them, but they put on their blinders and were going to do it their way. In the meantime, who pays? Canadians and Canadian jobs pay. At the end of the day, what does this country look like?

The Liberals inherited a balanced budget. They inherited a strong economy. They inherited a low unemployment rate. They have spent billions and billions of dollars, on what? What has it gone to? Has it gone to more government bureaucracy? I do not see any new bridges. I do not see any new roads. I do not see any new sewers or septic. I hear of a lot more bureaucrats being hired. I hear a lot of giggles and laughter over there. They can spend money like drunken sailors and they do not seem to care. I care, because my kids are going to pay for it. The graduation classes of 2018 are going to have to pay for the mistakes of the current government, and the Liberals do not care because they do not have to pay. It is not their money.

In closing, I look at this and I am amazed at how many times the government has refused to look at science, has refused to look at the evidence, and has decided to put things in place that go against science. The classic example is the number of bills they have put through this House of Commons where the minister gets the final say, not science and not industry. Decisions should be based on good science, whether it is a pipeline or a new food product. New food products should be based on science and whether they are safe to eat.

What do they put in? They put that the minister will decide, and by the way, the minister will decide without any consequences or any responsibility to inform how he or she came to that decision. They wonder why people do not want to invest in Canada. It is because it has become such an unpredictable environment to invest in. Why would they?

When we talk about a carbon tax cover-up, that is exactly what it is because I think they know the numbers and they do not want to tell us. The reason they do not want to tell us is that the numbers are bad and they are trying to look for another reason to hide this carbon tax. The latest spin is that it is the provinces' jurisdiction. Okay, if it is the provinces' jurisdiction, then they should butt out of Saskatchewan's business and mind their own.

● (1215)

Mr. Adam Vaughan (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Families, Children and Social Development (Housing and Urban Affairs), Lib.): Madam Speaker, I want to take up this notion that there is some report that this government has generated that it is not sharing with the Canadian people, because I have heard it referred to over and over again as a cover-up.

They acquired the document that was redacted through the Freedom of Information Act, which is a process entirely governed by public servants, not by the government of the day. The document they are holding up was released literally the day after the last federal election, before the results were even gazetted, before any members of this House of Commons were legally even put in their seats, let alone appointed as ministers. Even the Prime Minister had not been sworn in. The report that they are talking about is one that the previous government commissioned before it left office, and that the previous government played a role in composing and reporting.

I just wonder why the members opposite do not talk to members of the previous cabinet who may have read the document, held the document, had carriage of the document, understood the document, framed the terms of reference for the document, produced the document, held the document in their hands, and actually had the document before we even got into power. The document they want they had; they just forgot to read it. I am curious as to why they do not read their government documents. Is that really the way the rest of the cabinet functioned over the last 10 years?

Mr. Randy Hoback: Madam Speaker, there are a couple of points I am going to make. First, if it is not the Liberals' document, why are they hiding it? Why has it been redacted? If it is not their document, they should let people see it. The second point is that if it is not their document, where is their document? Why have you not done the research? Why have you not done the science? Why have you not allowed committees to do the studies to see the impacts? Why did you block it at every committee? The reality is that they know and they do not want us to know.

● (1220)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): I want to remind members that the debate is not to be going back and forth; rather, it is to be directed through the Speaker. I would also remind the member to address his replies to the Speaker and not the individual members or the government.

Questions and comments, the hon. member for Saanich—Gulf Islands.

Ms. Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP): Madam Speaker, I try to be as fair-minded as possible in this place. I would not have constructed the carbon tax the way it has been constructed. However, it is incontrovertible that the best evidence from around the world, from established agencies like the International Monetary Fund, the International Energy Agency, and the World Bank, is that all economies need to stop subsidizing fossil fuels, as Stephen Harper promised to do in 2009, and all economies need to put a price on carbon. In this country and this generation, I absolutely understand why the Liberals have structured it so that any province can design its own plan and the money will be returned to that province. Therefore, it is revenue neutral to the federal government. However, it is not clear whether it is going to be revenue neutral in the hands of that province, but that is up to the individual province.

Does the Conservative Party object to the idea that dumping pollution into the atmosphere should not be free?

Mr. Randy Hoback: Madam Speaker, I appreciate my colleague's open-mindedness. The question I would ask her is this. When we have a province like Saskatchewan that has a plan that is going to reduce emissions, will be good for the environment, and will meet all the targets that have been laid in front of us, why would the government not accept it? If that plan does not include a carbon tax, why is that a problem?

It should not be a problem if we have met all of our requirements and obligations but have done it in a different way. Why should the government be upset if it is done in a different way? It comes back to what the end game is for this carbon tax. The word is "taxation". That is the end game for the current government. Whether it is directly or indirectly, it will have more revenues from a carbon tax. It is going to take money out of the pockets of people and will not change the activities of the people on the ground. Rural farmers have to drive to town. They have to burn petrol. There is no way around it at this point in time, and there is no way around it in the near future. Why punish those rural farmers by taxing them? That is what Saskatchewan did. It found a better way to do it without punishing those rural farmers.

Mr. John Barlow (Foothills, CPC): Madam Speaker, I want to ask a very quick question of my colleague. The Liberal agriculture minister said that Canadian farmers support the carbon tax. I would like to ask the member what he is hearing from the farmers in his constituency.

Mr. Randy Hoback: Madam Speaker, laughing is the first part. The second part is, and we can see it on Twitter, "Who were you talking to? Are you delirious?" This is a classic example of the Liberals telling farmers what they should believe instead of listening to farmers and bringing it back to Ottawa. We have seen that from the member for Regina—Wascana over and over again. He goes from Ottawa to Regina and tells the people in Regina what they need to know, instead of taking the concerns from the people of Regina back to Ottawa. It is the classic Liberals. APAS and the Grain Growers of Canada have all come out publicly and said they are against a carbon tax, full stop.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Francis Scarpaleggia (Lac-Saint-Louis, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I will be splitting my time with the member for La Prairie.

[*English*]

The impacts of climate change, such as coastal erosion, thawing permafrost, and increases in heat waves, droughts, and flooding are already being felt throughout Canada. In response to the critical need to take urgent national action on this global issue, Canada's first ministers adopted the pan-Canadian framework on clean growth and climate change on December 9, 2016. One of the core elements of the framework is to put a price on carbon pollution throughout Canada.

Pricing carbon is widely recognized as an efficient way to reduce emissions at the lowest cost to business and consumers, and to support innovation and clean growth. The aim of putting a price on carbon pollution is to reduce emissions by sending a price signal to the economy as a whole. Businesses, investors, and consumers change their behaviour when they take carbon pricing into account in their daily decision-making.

Carbon pricing has worked all over the world, from British Columbia to California to the United Kingdom. In all of those places, emissions have dropped and the economy has continued to grow. Just recently, Environment and Climate Change Canada released a new analysis confirming that carbon pricing will do the same across Canada, significantly reducing emissions while maintaining strong economic growth.

The new study found that carbon pricing could reduce carbon pollution by up to 90 million tonnes across Canada in 2022, as much as taking 26 million cars off the road for a year or shutting down more than 20 coal plants. The study also found that GDP growth would remain strong with a nationwide price on carbon pollution. Canada's GDP is expected to grow by approximately 2% a year between now and 2022, with or without carbon pricing.

● (1225)

[*Translation*]

Almost 85% of Canadians already live in a province or territory that puts a price on carbon pollution, and all governments have committed to some form of carbon pricing.

To extend carbon pricing across Canada, in October 2016, the Prime Minister released the federal carbon pricing standard, a benchmark, that gives provinces and territories the flexibility to implement the type of system that is best for them, while setting certain basic criteria that all systems must meet to ensure that they are fair and effective.

The Government of Canada is also committed to developing and implementing a federal carbon pricing system as a backstop. This backstop will therefore apply to any province or territory that does not have a carbon pricing system that meets the federal standard.

The greenhouse gas pricing act establishes the legal framework for the federal carbon pricing system, which serves as a backstop. The primary objective of the act is to help reduce Canada's greenhouse gas emissions by ensuring that a price is set on carbon across Canada and that it increases over time.

As part of its commitment to the Canada-wide approach to carbon pricing, the government will apply the federal pricing system only to the provinces and territories that it lists in schedule 1 of the act because they do not have a system that meets the benchmark. It also states that it will assess the provincial and territorial systems annually to ensure that they continue to meet this benchmark.

The federal carbon pricing system introduced by the act has two components: a levy on fossil fuels that is generally payable by fuel producers or distributors, also known as "fuel costs"; and a performance-based system for industrial facilities, also known as "production-based pricing". These components are intended to complement each other and to ensure that there is no double pricing.

In December, the Minister of Finance and the Minister of the Environment and Climate Change wrote to the provincial and territorial governments to provide them with the carbon pricing timelines. Provinces and territories wishing to establish or maintain their own systems must confirm their intentions by September 1, 2018. The Government of Canada will then determine whether the provincial and territorial systems will meet the federal carbon pricing standard.

In provinces and territories that do not meet the federal standard, the federal carbon pricing system will apply as of January 1, 2019, at an initial price of $20 per tonne of emissions. Provincial and territorial systems will be assessed annually. This timeline provides clarity to everyone involved and will enable consumers, businesses, and investors to make informed decisions.

[*English*]

Businesses already know carbon pricing makes good sense. According to a report from the Carbon Disclosure Project, the number of companies with plans to internally price their own carbon pollution increased between 2014 and 2017, from 150 to almost 1,400. The list includes more than 100 of the world's largest companies, with total annual revenues of $7 trillion.

In Canada, many energy companies, our top five banks, and major consumer goods companies support a price on pollution. They are all part of the Carbon Pricing Leadership Coalition. They know carbon pricing can make Canadian businesses more innovative and competitive, and that it provides certainty to investors.

A recent study ranked Canada fourth in the world as a clean technology innovator, up from seventh place in 2014. Last year, 11 of Canada's clean-tech companies ranked in the top 100 worldwide.

Companies such as Winnipeg's Farmers Edge are developing cutting-edge technologies that help farmers waste less energy and increase their profits. Ecobee in Toronto makes smart thermostats that link up with smart phones to help Canadians save money and make their homes more comfortable. Dartmouth's CarbonCure has developed a technology to capture carbon pollution from industry and use it to make stronger concrete.

This is the kind of innovation and entrepreneurship carbon pricing is designed to support. These kinds of technologies help protect our environment, create new opportunities and middle-class jobs, and help our industries to compete.

According to the World Bank, jurisdictions representing about half the global economy are putting a price on carbon, and that does not include China's national system announced late last year. As of 2018, 70 jurisdictions around the world at the national and subnational levels are putting a price on carbon.

The approach to carbon pricing is going to ensure that Canadians are well placed to benefit from the opportunities created by the global transition that is now under way. Carbon pricing is the most effective way to reduce emissions. It creates incentives for businesses and households to innovate and pollute less. Innovation is key to keeping Canada's economy competitive. Carbon pricing brings down emissions while driving investment in energy efficiency and in cleaner, less polluting energy sources.

● (1230)

Mr. Harold Albrecht (Kitchener—Conestoga, CPC): Madam Speaker, I was not able to hear the member's entire speech, but I did hear a good portion of what he was sharing in his comments. It is clear that he is unwilling to use the term carbon tax.

What I find really disappointing is that the Liberal Party, for many weeks now, in fact months, has refused to tell Canadians how much the carbon tax will cost the average Canadian family. Worse still, it is not willing to share what impact that carbon tax will have on implementing greenhouse gas reductions.

Why put a carbon tax on something if it is not going to achieve what the Liberals say it is going to achieve, and then not disclose what the actual cost will be?

Mr. Francis Scarpaleggia: Madam Speaker, the government has produced a report, and I mentioned it in my speech.

Essentially the problem with the opposition is that it views the economy as a single-lever mechanism, almost like a well pump, where cause and effect are clear.

The economy is made up of millions of decisions made by individual consumers, by businesses, and by governments.

In the report that is on the website, and I would encourage members to turn on their computer and access the website, there is a quote, as follows:

> Accurately assessing how pricing carbon pollution could affect the economy and emissions depends on the choices governments make about which carbon pricing system they adopt—a direct price, a cap-and-trade system, or a hybrid system. How they choose to use the revenues generated from carbon pricing also has a big impact. Revenue can be used for rebates, tax cuts, incentives for energy efficiency or investments in clean infrastructure and innovation. Furthermore, forecasting future economic conditions involves simplifying very complex systems and making many assumptions, resulting in an inherent amount of uncertainty.

Ms. Sheila Malcolmson (Nanaimo—Ladysmith, NDP): Madam Speaker, under the previous Conservative government, former prime minister Harper received "Fossil of the Year" awards repeatedly at international climate conferences, yet the Liberal government continues to carry on with the same discredited greenhouse gas emission reduction targets of the Conservative Party.

While New Democrats agree that putting a price on carbon pollution is important, as it is for all forms of pollution, we are extremely discouraged that the Liberal government continues to subsidize fossil fuel expansion, including purchasing a leaky old pipeline. It is mind-blowing, honestly, to think that is where we are.

How does the member opposite view carbon pricing in conjunction with a failure to further reduce greenhouse gas emissions beyond what the Harper Conservatives promised?

● (1235)

Mr. Francis Scarpaleggia: Madam Speaker, the Conservative government did not perform on this issue. I could not agree more with the member. The reason was that even though it talked about targets and put targets in the window, it never took the actions necessary to achieve those targets.

Our government is taking probably the single biggest measure possible to eliminate fossil fuel subsidies. The biggest fossil fuel subsidy that exists is the fact that the cost of pollution is not internalized in businesses and organizations that pollute. A price on carbon is meant to take account of that externality, which is the cost of pollution to our environment and to our society. The biggest subsidy of all is the fact that it does not cost to pollute, to produce greenhouse gas emissions and put them into the environment.

The government is taking the strongest step possible in this regard. As the member knows, there is really no agreed-upon definition of what constitutes a fossil fuel subsidy, other than the fact that when there is not a price on carbon and when polluting is free, that is the biggest subsidy of all.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Jean-Claude Poissant (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I welcome the opportunity to further address the member's question on a carbon price in agriculture.

In fact, in many ways agriculture is leading the way in our transition to a low-carbon economy. Feeding a growing world population with sustainable agriculture is one of the defining challenges of our time. How do we achieve this goal? One word: innovation. Sustainability and innovation go hand in hand. The agriculture sector already has a solid track record of innovating and adopting new technologies to improve environmental performance and reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

In fact, for more than a decade, greenhouse gases from agriculture have remained stable despite growth in production. A century ago, the average farmer produced enough food for about ten people. Today, that farmer can feed well over a hundred.

There is no doubt that science is our most powerful tool when it comes to environment and climate change issues. Thanks to science, Canadian farmers are producing more food with less land and less water. We can indeed have sustainable agriculture for generations to come, but we need to be willing to invest. The government places a high priority on helping farmers adjust to the effects of climate change. Climate change and environment are at the heart of Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada's new Canadian agricultural partnership.

Through this partnership, over the next five years, the federal, provincial, and territorial governments will invest $3 billion in key priorities of the agriculture sector—including the environment. Programs will help farmers capitalize on opportunities for sustainable growth while adapting to climate change. They will help farmers adopt agriculture technologies and tools to reduce GHG emissions.

Another tremendous success story is the environmental farm plans. The program helps farmers sit down and make an environmental plan for their farm, targeting practical solutions that they can use to help the environment, while boosting their bottom line.

Supported by federal-provincial-territorial funding, over the past quarter century, more than 70,000 Canadian farmers have developed environmental farm plans. Our scientists, working with universities and industry, are also fully engaged in the fight against climate change.

Under budget 2017, Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada is investing $70 million in agricultural science to address emerging priorities, such as climate change and soil and water conservation.

We are proud to be a government that recognizes science and research as important drivers of clean growth in the agricultural sector.

We will continue to support science and research, including on innovative ways to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. This includes our investment of $25 million to support the adoption of clean technology by Canadian agricultural producers.

The $2-billion low-carbon economy fund helps provinces and territories to reduce GHG emissions, for example through carbon storage in agricultural soils.

Furthermore, the government is investing $27 million in the agricultural greenhouse gases program to help farmers reduce their carbon footprint. This program is helping farmers reduce greenhouse gases and adjust to climate change in four key areas: management and feeding strategies, capturing carbon through land and tillage practices, agroforestry, and irrigation and drainage for crop production. There are 20 projects at leading universities across Canada, all focused on helping farmers make their farms even greener than they are today.

● (1240)

Recent projects include measuring the environmental footprint of blueberry, potato, and forage cropping systems; environmentally-friendly grazing systems for cattle; and new cereal crops that do not have to be planted every year, saving fertilizer and water. There is also the $5.2-million agricultural youth green jobs initiative, which helps place young Canadians in green jobs within the agriculture sector.

My message today is that Canadian farmers are, and will continue to be, part of the climate change solution. That is why our carbon pricing policy reflects the realities of Canada's agricultural industry. Our government recognizes that Canadian farmers and farm families are important drivers of the Canadian economy. We understand that Canadian farmers are making important contributions in the fight against climate change, for example by adopting sustainable technologies and practices like precision agriculture or conservation tillage.

We know that farmers are price takers and cannot easily pass cost increases on to consumers. That is why gasoline and diesel fuel for on-farm use is exempt from carbon pricing under the federal backstop. Alberta and British Columbia have already exempted these fuels from their carbon pricing policies. Furthermore, emissions from crop and livestock production will not be subject to carbon pricing under the federal backstop.

Over 70% of Canadian farms are located in provinces that already have a carbon pricing system in place. British Columbia, Quebec, Alberta, and Ontario, which account for 80% of Canada's GHG emissions, have already implemented carbon pricing mechanisms.

The pan-Canadian framework on clean growth and climate change was negotiated with the provinces and territories. This historic national framework recognizes that climate action may differ from one region to the next across the country. That is why the framework gives jurisdictions the flexibility to design approaches to pricing pollution that best suit their conditions and priorities, provided they meet the federal benchmark. The provinces and territories are invited to develop their own pricing schemes. They can therefore keep the direct revenues they raise from carbon pricing to use as they see fit.

Ontario and Quebec have cap and trade systems in place. Alberta has a hybrid pricing system. In all three provinces, these systems include opportunities for producers to sell their emission reductions for cash payment. Many producers in Alberta were paid because they used no-till farming.

Stakeholders have asked to be consulted and we are listening. The government will continue to engage industries, provincial and territorial governments, indigenous peoples, environmental groups, and stakeholders on the design of the federal carbon pricing system.

Canada has the opportunity to be a global leader when it comes to feeding a growing world population sustainably. The government will provide the investments needed to maximize and accelerate the efforts of our farmers, our scientists, and industry. The government is committed to supporting farmers as they continue to be responsible stewards of our land, and will continue to work with farmers to help them capture sustainable growth while adapting to climate change.

● (1245)

[*English*]

Mr. Harold Albrecht (Kitchener—Conestoga, CPC): Madam Speaker, I want to thank my colleague for drawing attention to the great agricultural initiatives that are improving our soil quality.

I have some of the best farmers in all of Canada in my riding, Kitchener—Conestoga. In fact, many are being proactive by planting cover crops to sequester carbon and by reducing tillage and fuel use. They are already doing many of these activities. However, added to that we have this punishing carbon tax, which, in my riding, is going to add up to $6,000 for an average farmer just for fuel.

My colleague says that two provinces have exempted fuel for farms, but Ontario is not one of them. Therefore, in my riding, a farmer will pay an extra $6,000 just because of this carbon tax, and that does not count the cost of getting his produce to market, whether that is grain or livestock, or getting fuel or fertilizer to his farm.

This is punishing our farmers, and worse than that, this cost will be added and passed on to middle-class Canadians. Why is the government punishing them in that way?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Jean-Claude Poissant: Madam Speaker, Canadians know that there is a cost to pollution. We see it in the droughts, floods, forest fires, and extreme weather events that are occurring. We see it in the effects that pollution has on our health. It is time polluters paid the price.

Ensuring that there is a price on pollution across the country is a matter of fairness. Putting a price on pollution helps us to fight climate change, reduce greenhouse gas emissions, put money in Canadians' pockets, and above all, create jobs for the middle class.

[*English*]

Ms. Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP): Madam Speaker, as I was listening to the debate here today, a bulletin just came through on my computer about a new, disturbing report that the west Antarctic ice sheet is melting three times faster than it was the last time it was checked.

When sea ice melts, it does not affect the sea level. It can affect currents, such as the Gulf Stream, but because it is ice floating on water, it does not cause sea level rise. However, ice sheets, such as the Greenland ice sheet and the west Antarctic ice sheet, sit on land. This is global research in which the University of Toronto collaborated, and it states that if we lose either one of those, it would contribute eight metres to sea level rise. That is eight metres of sea level rise from a single event, if we lose the west Antarctic ice sheet or the Greenland ice sheet.

The hon. member detailed a number of measures we have taken so far. They are not sufficient to meet the Paris target. We are not aiming at the right target. This kind of information requires the kind of full-court press that says the government will do everything it can to preserve every coastal city. I would ask for the member's response to that.

● (1250)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Jean-Claude Poissant: Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague for her question.

Almost every carbon pricing system in the world includes a mechanism for protecting competitiveness and heavy industry. That includes the systems in Alberta, Ontario, Quebec, California, the European Union, and China. We are generating clean economic growth in Canada while protecting competitiveness.

Jurisdictions representing nearly half the global economy are putting a price on carbon, but some companies in Canada compete with other companies that are not subject to a carbon tax. We will continue to protect our environment. As we have been saying from the start, economic development and the environment go hand in hand.

[*English*]

Mr. Harold Albrecht (Kitchener—Conestoga, CPC): Madam Speaker, I will be sharing my time with the hon. member for Barrie—Springwater—Oro-Medonte.

For a party that campaigned in 2015 on running an open and transparent government and on being "open by default", it really is sad to see it has broken this promise, along with many other promises it made in the 2015 campaign.

We had no other choice but to bring this motion forward today. I want to read the motion. It states:

> That, given the government's failure to provide a clear explanation of the costs of its carbon tax policy, and given that the people of Ontario have rejected the carbon tax, the House call on the government to table, by June 22, 2018, how much the proposed federal carbon tax of $50 per tonne will cost a median Canadian family.

The government knows how much this tax will cost Canadians. It has documents that outline exactly how much it will cost, and we have those documents as well. The only difference is the documents we received have redacted information. That does not sound like "open by default" to me. What exactly do the Liberals have to hide behind all that black ink? We have a pretty good idea of what they are trying to hide by covering up these numbers.

The Parliamentary Budget Officer has provided us with some unsavoury data. In his most recent economic and fiscal outlook he found:

> Implementation of [the federal government's] carbon pricing levy...will generate a headwind for the Canadian economy over the medium term as the levy rises from $10 per tonne of CO2 equivalent in 2018 to $50 per tonne in 2022. Based...on analysis conducted by the Ecofiscal Commission, we project that real GDP will be 0.5 per cent lower in 2022 [than it would otherwise be]. This amounts to $10 billion in 2022.

That is $10 billion out of our economy.

The Parliamentary Budget Officer speaks of headwinds. All of us who travel to Ottawa know how headwinds impact us. Travelling on the 401, the 407, or the 417, when we are travelling into headwinds we know our gas mileage is going to go down significantly. Likewise, we know the carbon tax will decrease our GDP significantly.

What this government has been open about since being elected is that it has no desire to control its reckless spending and bring the budget back to balance. Now we know that its plan to force a carbon tax on the provinces to finance its growing national debt will not even help balance the budget. It will do the exact opposite. It is going to cost our Canadian economy an extra $10 billion.

In addition to the damaging effects the tax will have on our economy, it will raise the cost of everything for my constituents of Kitchener—Conestoga. The Liberals admit that gasoline prices will go up by at least 11¢ a litre and that the cost of heating one's home will increase by over $200. The members of the Liberal Party may not think that is a lot of money, but for middle-class Canadians in my riding every penny counts. The Liberals forget that the decisions to commute to work, drive their kids to soccer or hockey practice, heat their homes, or travel to see loved ones are real choices to be made and that there are real costs involved. My constituents in Kitchener—Conestoga often have to commute into Toronto and other parts of Ontario for work, to visit family, or to watch a Blue Jays game. The Liberal carbon tax is going to force my constituents to choose between those important things and putting food on the table.

This past winter, in most parts of Canada, it was a pretty cold one. Perhaps members of the Liberal Party prefer to spend winters in Florida, or somewhere warm, but I can assure them, southwestern Ontario is known to dip well below freezing in the winter months, and that is what makes this carbon tax even more outrageous. It will punish Canadians for heating their homes. This is not a frivolous expense. It is an absolute necessity, and when asked about these rising costs, the Prime Minister responded that this is exactly what the government wants. The government should be working to lower taxes for Canadians and making life more affordable, not working to punish Canadians and impose unwanted taxes on the provinces.

That brings me to my next point. Last week, Ontarians were loud and clear. They are sick and tired of the Liberals' reckless spending, and they do not support a carbon tax. Ontarians have had enough with the failed energy plans of the Ontario Liberals and this Liberal government in Ottawa.

The provincial governments of Ontario and Saskatchewan have indicated they will be taking the federal government to court to fight against its top-down, heavy-handed, mandatory carbon tax.

● (1255)

Alberta will soon join them in opposing this tax that does absolutely nothing to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. What has become crystal clear since the Liberals formed government in 2015, is that their approach to federalism has left this country fractured. One only has to look at Alberta and British Columbia with two NDP governments warring with one another, introducing tariffs, and taking each other to court, all as a result of the government's failed leadership.

Under our Conservative government we saw an overall reduction in greenhouse gas emissions and we did not raise taxes to do it. We focused on target regulations, incremental changes, and encouraging provinces to create their own individual plans. Members opposite would claim that we did not do anything for the environment, but that is simply not the case. As former chair of the environment committee, I know that our government was committed to cleaning up the environment, investing in wetlands, investing in conservation, and encouraging sustainable energy. That is how we see real change. In fact, during our government's mandate, greenhouse gas emissions reduced while the economy grew.

Canadians and Conservatives understand that we cannot tax our way to a cleaner environment. Take British Columbia as an example. Despite having the highest carbon tax in Canada, emissions have continued to rise in British Columbia. As a result, British Columbians now pay more for gas than anyone else in North America. British Columbia's carbon tax is not helping the environment, it is just costing people more to get to work and to take their kids to hockey or soccer practice.

Before the next election, our Conservative leader will be unveiling a detailed and comprehensive environmental plan. One thing that one can be sure about our plan, though, is that it will not punish everyday Canadians for commuting to work or for heating their homes.

Last, I would be remiss if I did not talk about the effect this carbon tax will have on our farmers. I represent some of Canada's best farmers in the rural part of Kitchener—Conestoga. I know that farmers are the best stewards of the land and that no one cares more about the well-being of our environment than they do.

Dale Leftwich, writing for RealAgriculture, has this to say in regard to farmers' impact on the environment and the effects of a federal liberal carbon tax:

> Scientists are beginning to fully understand how much carbon is being sequestered in soils by farmers. There is evidence that reductions in summer fallow and new farming methods are improving soil health and increasing soil organic matter. In other words, the depletion of the soil which began with the first plowing has been reversed in recent years, and farms are now on a more sustainable footing. If pricing carbon acts as a deterrent to this trend, it will be worse than ineffective, it will be disastrous.

He went on to say:

> There is a long shadow in Canada of poorly conceived energy policies. These have strained interprovincial relations and limited economic growth. Some see carbon pricing as déjà vu all over again. They suspect that urban dwellers will benefit from increased economic activity and jobs while farmers will be forced to foot the bill. Many farmers are also skeptical about the doom and gloom scenarios so common today. At the same time, because farmland sequesters huge amounts of carbon, farmers want to be considered part of the solution rather than part of the problem. Most do not want a cheque for what they do but would like to be left alone to farm in a sustainable manner, and not be harassed by yet another costly program based on incomplete science. They worry that expensive, ineffective onerous policies will be put in place, not because they are scientifically proven, but because they are popular. And that is an inconvenient truth that should worry us all.

I could not have said it better. I hope that members opposite will stand up for transparency, stand up for middle-class Canadians, and support this Conservative motion.

● (1300)

Mr. Vance Badawey (Niagara Centre, Lib.): Madam Speaker, coming from the municipal sector, I recognized quickly that there were methods to the way we charge people in terms of what their impacts are and therefore who pays for it. I will give an example of development charges.

Development charges are placed on a developer who creates growth-related costs. This then takes the emphasis off the overall population, the taxpayer, and places it on the person who actually creates those growth-related costs. This concept is no different. This is the same by recognizing who is responsible for pollution and pollution-related costs, taking the emphasis off the overall taxpayer and placing it on those who are creating the pollution-related costs.

Therefore, does the presenter not recognize that while he states they want to invest in environmental initiatives, wetlands, infrastructure, water, waste water, drainage for our farmers, health care, all those are unfortunately the bearer of those pollution-related costs? Does the presenter not agree that the direction we have taken will be a proper direction to then alleviate the pressure on the overall taxpayer regardless of what level of government may exact taxes, to then therefore deal with the problem?

Mr. Harold Albrecht: Madam Speaker, I have the privilege of working with my colleague on the Standing Joint Committee on the Scrutiny of Regulations and enjoy his input very much. We work very well collaboratively.

My colleague commented about the developmental costs at a municipal level, which are the costs for something, but there is an effect at the other end, where people end up with a new bridge, a new road, a new sewer system, or a new water system. All we are asking for is exactly what he is referring to. We want to know what the developmental costs will be. What is the cost of this carbon tax to the average Canadian family, but, more importantly, will there actually be an effect? Will it actually help to do what Liberals say it is going to do?

We asked people at the environment committee and directly asked the question of the minister: What will the reduction in greenhouse gas emissions be as a result of implementing this carbon tax? The answer was silence, no answer. That is not acceptable. We need to know both the cost and effect to know whether we can invest in this process.

Mr. Terry Beech (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Fisheries, Oceans and the Canadian Coast Guard, Lib.): Madam Speaker, there were five or six things that were somewhat misleading, or perhaps the member opposite just does not know about British Columbia, but there are two things I want to point out.

The member stated that we are instituting this to finance a growing national debt. It is well known that all of the funds collected are being distributed to the provinces, so none of them will go toward the federal debt.

I want to talk about the B.C. case. B.C. first instituted carbon pricing in 2008, so it has had carbon pricing for 10 years. We know that, per person, carbon emissions went down by 16% in British Columbia in the first six years, while it went up in the rest of Canada by 3% over the same time period. Also during that exact time period, British Columbia had one of the fastest growing economies in the entire country.

If I can prove to the member opposite that fossil fuel emissions can be decreased with a carbon price while growing the economy, would he support it?

Mr. Harold Albrecht: Madam Speaker, the point of our motion that we have been debating all day and will be for a few more hours is to simply give us the facts. The government knows what the facts are. It is in black and white in the document, but for us it is black. How can we buy something when we do not know what the cost will be, especially when we do not know what the effect will be?

If my colleague is so convinced that he can simply extrapolate from British Columbia to all of Canada, then let us have the numbers. Let us see what they are.

Mr. Alexander Nuttall (Barrie—Springwater—Oro-Medonte, CPC): Madam Speaker, it is certainly an honour to rise today on the opposition motion. Before I start, I would like to comment on the direct words related to the opposition day motion. This is not the first time that members of the opposition have been asking for information related to the proposed carbon tax and the effect it would have on the economy. In fact, in the industry committee, on October 23, 2016, a year and a half ago, I moved a motion that said:

> That...the [Standing Committee on Industry, Science and Technology] conduct a pre-budget study on the effects that the recently-announced Liberal Government carbon tax would have on the manufacturing sector; that this study be comprised of no less than four meetings to be held at the Committee's earliest convenience; [and] that departmental officials from Innovation, Science, and Economic Development Canada be in attendance for at least one meeting....

Unfortunately, members of the Liberal Party who sat on the committee blocked it and blocked it. After a month of fighting for the motion, eventually it was voted down as something that would never hit the floor of the industry committee.

Now, we fast-forward a year and a half. There has been request after request. The member for Carleton put forward a request asking for information related to the carbon tax: what effects it would have on the economy, what effects it would have on jobs for people back in our ridings, what effects it would have globally on the Canadian economy, and how it would affect our competitiveness versus that of other countries, specifically those to the south.

We have seen the effects of these Liberal schemes before. We have seen them in Ontario, where we have manufacturing jobs running across the border at an alarming rate, specifically in southwestern Ontario. We know what the costs of these types of decisions are. What we do not know is the specifics related to the carbon tax that the Liberal government has put forward.

It is interesting that the Liberals promised they would be transparent. The Prime Minister promised it in his throne speech. It was actually all through the throne speech that opened this Parliament:

> I call on all parliamentarians to work together, with a renewed spirit of innovation, openness and collaboration.

It is not openness when the Liberals black out the results of a request for information.

The speech went on to say:

> Canada succeeds in large part because here, diverse perspectives and different opinions are celebrated, not silenced.

However, that is what the government is doing. It is silencing the report to the opposition MPs and Canadians overall.

The speech also said:

> In this Parliament, all members will be honoured, respected and heard, wherever they sit. For here, in these chambers, the voices of all Canadians matter.
>
> Let us not forget, however, that Canadians have been clear and unambiguous in their desire for real change.

I did not know that real change meant blacking out results that Canadians were asking for.

> Canadians want their government to do different things, and to do things differently.

I was not here for any of the previous parliaments, but I can guess that when the government was stating this, it probably was not saying that it was going to black out documents going forward so that Canadians do not know the cost of the decisions that the Liberal government and the Liberal MPs are making on their behalf.

The speech said:

> They want to be able to trust their government.

How can they trust a government that is holding information from them that is going to affect every piece of their life? The tax is going affect literally everything.

The speech went on to say:

> And they want leadership that is focused on the things that matter most to them.
>
> Things like growing the economy; creating jobs; strengthening the middle class, and helping those working hard to join it.

What we are looking for right now is the answer. What effect is this carbon tax going to have, not just on those in the middle class, not just on those who have jobs today, but on those who are working hard to join it, those who are the poorest in society, who find it the most difficult to be able to fill up their gas tanks?

I was in B.C. over the last couple of days, and I took a drive. When I went to take the rental car back, I was amazed. The gas was $1.61 at the pumps, absolutely shocking.

The throne speech said:

> Through careful consideration and respectful conduct, the Government can meet these challenges, and all others brought before it.

That is just the opening statement on openness and transparency, which the government committed to in its first act in the House, in the throne speech.

● (1305)

It went on to say:

> The Government will undertake these and other initiatives while pursuing a fiscal plan that is responsible [it is not], transparent [it is not] and suited to challenging economic times.

We know that the times are challenging, with all the things going on in terms cross-border disputes. We know that the times are challenging, with all the new taxes that have been brought forward by the government. We know that the times are challenging, when manufacturing jobs are running south. We know that the times are challenging, because we hear it at the door day after day.

There is an entire section of the throne speech called "Open and Transparent Government". Are they kidding?

> [T]he Government is committed to open and transparent government.

I guess I could just end there and we could move on to the questions portion. I could answer every single question with that exact statement, "the Government is committed to open and transparent government", except when it blacks out documents so that Canadians do not get to know how much the Liberal carbon tax will actually cost them.

> The trust Canadians have in public institutions—including Parliament—has, at times, been compromised. By working with greater openness and transparency, Parliament can restore it.

Please explain to me, members of the Liberal Party, how are you restoring the confidence in Parliament when you are blacking out the documents related to questions being asked by the people's representatives?

● (1310)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): I would remind the member to address his comments to the Chair.

Mr. Alexander Nuttall: Madam Speaker, when we go further into the throne speech, we see this:

> Decisions will be informed by scientific evidence.

The interesting thing here is that this is actually in the portion of the speech that talks about a clean environment and a strong economy. It does actually touch on the carbon tax, or carbon pricing, carbon levy, or whatever the Liberal government would like to call it today.

It says that decisions "will be informed by scientific evidence." Well, part of that evidence is what the cost is. What are the ramifications and consequences of introducing such a tax?

We have had the opportunity here, for two and half years, to discuss this carbon tax. It was discussed before it was brought forward and while it was brought forward. It has been discussed probably in every committee that functions as part of the House. Certainly, it will continue to be discussed until we have the answers.

The interesting thing is that the Auditor General came out with a report last week that talked about the culture of the government. In the report, the Auditor General essentially states that the government is trying to determine whether or not it is successful by the amount of money it spends. That is not a direct fit to the Auditor General's statements, but I think there is an analogy here, in the sense that the government is trying to determine its success related to the carbon tax by how much it is taxing Canadians, not by the results that will come from it.

If the Liberals were determined to create a carbon tax based on a results-driven program or process, they would be telling us what the effects would be. What would be the effects of $50 per tonne? What effect would that have on curbing carbon use? What effect would it have on middle-class Canadians? What effect would it have on those who are the least fortunate in our society to be able to continue living their lives?

It is also interesting that the Auditor General essentially states that the culture of government we see today is one that is driven by marketing, one that is driven by Twitter and Facebook, one that is driven by a 30-second bit on a political show or on the news. That is clearly what we have seen. We saw a minister get off a plane and say, $50 over five years, and $10 per year to the provinces. However, what we have not seen, beyond that marketing, is what effect it would have on the Canadian economy and the Canadian people.

What government members need to do, whether they are cabinet members, backbenchers, or parliamentary secretaries, is force the hand of the environment minister, the Prime Minister, and the finance minister to tell Canadians how this carbon tax would affect them today.

Mr. Adam Vaughan (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Families, Children and Social Development (Housing and Urban Affairs), Lib.): Madam Speaker, just to be clear, what the member opposite is asking for is a document that the Conservatives produced for themselves about a policy they were thinking about. It was produced and written before we were even sworn in as a government, which means it has nothing to do with the policies we have introduced. The report they crave is not about a policy of this government; it is about a policy of the government they used to be part of.

I was going to make an access to information request for the Conservatives' climate change plan. However, I realized that not only could I not get it, but they could not even redact it, because it does not exist. That is the problem.

If the member opposite really wants to know what we are doing about climate change and what the price on carbon is all about, I direct him to https://www.canada.ca/en/services/environment/weather/climatechange/climate-action/pricing-carbon-pollution/estimated-impacts-federal-system.html. Everything we have done about our policy is on the web. Everything about your policy exists on a piece of paper that was redacted. As a government, we have released everything.

Could the member opposite please tell me why he wants a document from his former cabinet members?

● (1315)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): I want to remind the member to address the questions to the Chair, because it is not about my policy.

The hon. member for Barrie—Springwater—Oro-Medonte.

Mr. Alexander Nuttall: Madam Speaker, I think the member missed a couple of slashes: /redaction/blackout/we-are-not-going-to-tell-the-people-exactly-what-the-carbon-tax-is-going-to-cost-them.

I can understand that the member gets very upset when he cannot even get the information from his own government related to the carbon tax that is going to affect his constituents. That is okay. However, I would like to remind the member that your government—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): I know it is a very passionate debate, but maybe if the member looks at me instead of looking at the other members he will get it right.

Mr. Alexander Nuttall: Madam Speaker, I think that you waited until the end with the previous member, but I will.

If the member looks at the throne speech, I think you will see that the government is committed to an open and transparent government. I would ask all members, including the Speaker of the House, to look at that. We need to be able to see the results from the requests that have been put forward by the opposition members.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): Again, I want to remind the member to address all questions and comments to the Chair.

Questions and comments, the hon. member for Vancouver Kingsway.

Mr. Don Davies (Vancouver Kingsway, NDP): Madam Speaker, in my riding, Vancouver Kingsway, there is a strong consensus. It is not unanimous, but a clear majority of people are very concerned about the impacts of climate change. Last summer, terrible forest fires, some of the worst since the 1950s, burned so much in British Columbia that there was actually a haze in Vancouver for many days in the summer. We are seeing an early spring runoff now, and there is flooding that is approaching the Lower Mainland of British Columbia, which is a rare event.

The truth is that if we take climate change seriously, we have to take extraordinary steps now in order to avoid a rise in temperature of 2° centigrade by 2050, and by all accounts we are not on target for that.

The Liberals talk a good game. However, they signed Kyoto in 1997. That is 20 years ago. Eddie Goldenberg, who was Prime Minister Chrétien's assistant, publicly stated afterwards that they had no intention of ever meeting those targets. Therefore, Canadians can be rightfully suspicious of their claims now, particularly when we hear a lot of talk but the emissions are not going down.

What does my hon. colleague think it tells Canadians when the Liberals continue to tell them that they want to deal with climate change but there are never any reductions in GHG emissions or carbon emissions when they are in government?

Mr. Alexander Nuttall: Madam Speaker, the member is absolutely correct. First, we need to recognize that, in terms of reduction in GHG emissions in Canada, there was a time when that happened. It was under the previous Conservative government, and we are very proud of that record.

Second, what the current government needs to do is take a step back and determine what it is trying to achieve in hard measurables. Once it has done that, it should come to the House and explain it to us so that we can have measurables in place to determine whether this has been a success or not.

Mr. Andy Fillmore (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Democratic Institutions, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I will be splitting my time today with the member for Hastings—Lennox and Addington.

Around the world, the effects of climate change are becoming increasingly evident. Sea levels are rising, threatening coastal regions with increased erosion. Extreme events, like floods and wild fires, are becoming more and more common and severe, and in the north, where temperatures are rising at three times the global average, the permafrost is thawing and sea ice is melting. As the climate continues to change, these effects will only become more frequent and more severe.

The government is taking the challenge of climate change very seriously. We have a comprehensive clean growth and climate plan that includes historic investments in public transit, green infrastructure, and clean innovation. It includes phasing out coal, improving energy efficiency, and cutting methane emissions from the oil and gas sector, and it includes a national price on carbon pollution.

I am quite proud to say that our plan now also includes putting a climate lens on infrastructure funded by the federal government. I would like to pause on that new green filter for just a moment, because it is a recent development and one that I have been working towards since my first days as a member of Parliament.

In 2016, I introduced private member's Motion No. 45 to this House, calling on the government to take into account the impact infrastructure has on Canada's greenhouse gas emissions. As the MP for Halifax, I represent one of Canada's primary coastal cities, and it is no exaggeration to say that Halifax is on the front lines of climate change when it comes to threats like worsening storms and sea level rise.

At the same time, our government is making an historic investment in infrastructure, $180 billion over 12 years. That is an investment that is going to transform our communities for the better. We also know, at the same time, that infrastructure has the potential to lock in greenhouse gas emissions for years to come.

We find ourselves at a pivotal moment in our history. It is a moment that comes with a remarkable opportunity and a responsibility to get it right. That is why, in 2016, I put forward Motion No. 45, requesting that the government put a climate lens on infrastructure that it chooses to fund. It passed, and I am so glad that this climate lens has now been worked into federal policy as a required part of the bilateral funding agreements being signed between the Government of Canada and all provinces and territories. That means that as part of our infrastructure plan, applicants seeking federal funding for new major public infrastructure projects will now have to undertake an assessment of how their projects will impact greenhouse gas emissions and consider the climate change risks in the location, design, operation, and maintenance of those projects. As a city planner and as the MP for Halifax, I view that as a significant win for our city and for the sustainability and resiliency of communities all across Canada.

I have just outlined some of the measures our government has put in place to protect our environment, but of course, we are here today to talk about putting a price on carbon pollution. Why? We are doing it because pricing carbon pollution works. It is the most effective, least expensive way to achieve our climate goals. It encourages innovation and keeps our economy strong. The simple fact is that without carbon pricing, cutting pollution would be much more expensive.

Canadians know that pollution is not free. Climate pollution leads to droughts and floods and wild fires and extreme weather, and all of these have major costs. Insurance claims from severe weather in Canada have been going up. They are more than three times higher today than they were in the 1980s and 1990s, a trend that is expected to continue.

Pollution also harms people's health, which has personal physiological costs and monetary costs for our health care system. Right now, it is the people most affected by these impacts who are paying the price: northerners; coastal communities; the people whose homes are flooded, as we saw in New Brunswick this spring; or those with asthma or other health conditions worsened by pollution. That is not right.

Carbon pricing, on the other hand, is based on the idea that the polluter should pay. Experts around the world agree. Carbon pricing is one of the most cost-effective ways to reduce emissions. That is because it is not prescriptive. It allows companies and individuals to make their own decisions on how best to cut their emissions.

In Canada, more than 80% of us already live in jurisdictions with carbon pricing in place. Recognizing that each province and territory has unique circumstances, the pan-Canadian approach would allow provinces and territories the flexibility to choose a system that makes the most sense for them: an explicit price-based system, like in B.C. or Alberta; or a cap and trade system, like in Ontario and Quebec.

To ensure that a price on carbon pollution is in place across Canada, the Government of Canada has also committed to developing and implementing a federal carbon-pricing system as a backstop. This system would apply in any province or territory that requested it or that did not have a carbon pricing system in place by 2018 that met the federal standard.

● (1320)

We have seen how carbon pricing has worked in British Columbia. Over the past decade, B.C.'s carbon price has reduced emissions by between 5% and 15%. Meanwhile, provincial real GDP grew by more than 17% from 2007 to 2015, and per capita gasoline demand dropped 15% over that period. B.C.'s growing clean technology sector now brings in an estimated $1.7 billion in annual revenue.

In 2017, B.C., Alberta, Ontario, and Quebec, the four provinces with carbon pricing systems in place, were also the top four performers in GDP growth across Canada. Anyone who says that carbon pricing hurts economies is not basing their arguments on science or the evidence but rather on ignorance and fear.

Consider this. People may have seen recently that the Government of Canada released a report showing that carbon pricing could reduce carbon pollution by up to 90 million tonnes across Canada by 2022. That is like taking 26 million cars off the road for a year or shutting down more than 20 coal plants.

At the same time, the report also found that GDP growth would remain strong with a nationwide price on carbon pollution. Canada's GDP is expected to grow by approximately two per cent per year between now and 2022, with or without carbon pricing. Regular changes in energy prices have a much bigger impact on the GDP than our carbon pricing plan.

We do know that carbon pricing will affect the price of fuel and other goods and services. Today the opposition is asking what it will cost families. Here is an example. The Government of Alberta has calculated the cost of its system. The direct cost for a family of four is about $500 per year. However, that is not the whole story, because if that family makes less than $95,000 a year, it will get a rebate of $540. That is right. It will actually come out ahead because of carbon pricing. About 60% of Alberta households receive a full or partial rebate to offset the cost of the carbon levy.

External studies have come up with a variety of estimates for what carbon pricing might cost. What these studies tend to agree on is that actual costs depend a lot on how provinces and territories design their carbon pricing systems and how they reinvest carbon pricing revenues back into the economy. Some households will face costs, but others will come out ahead financially, depending on the choices in each jurisdiction.

The Conservative opposition knows that, despite all this misdirection and pointless droning on on this point. It knows that the federal government has asked the provinces and territories to confirm the details of their systems by September, and it knows that wherever the federal system applies, all direct revenues will be returned to the jurisdiction of origin.

What the Conservatives may not know, and what they do not seem to care about, is just how expensive inaction on climate change could prove to be. Estimates suggest that climate change could cost Canada $5 billion a year by 2020 and as much as $43 billion by 2050.

With that in mind, I would like to conclude my remarks with some reflection on a quote earlier this month by Steve Williams, the CEO of Canada's largest oil company, Suncor. He was speaking in Calgary, right in the heartland of Canadian climate change denial, and he was talking about the current Conservative political discourse around climate change.

He said:

> It is a matter of profound disappointment to me that science and economics have taken on some strange political ownership, why the science of the left-wing is different than the science of the right-wing....
>
> Climate change is science, hard-core science.

He is right. There is no good reason why all members of this House cannot work together, agree on climate science and agree on the evidence that carbon pricing works and move forward to protect our planet for our kids. This does not have to be a political partisan spectacle. I will continue to work, as will this government, to make sure that one day, before it is too late, we will all see that we have no other choice.

● (1325)

Mr. Harold Albrecht (Kitchener—Conestoga, CPC): Madam Speaker, my colleague indicated that a number of the provinces are working in a situation where there is already carbon pricing. I want to remind him that the number of provinces that are in agreement with the carbon tax policy is rapidly decreasing.

My colleague said that anyone who says that a carbon tax will negatively impact the economy is working out of ignorance or fear. I want to remind my colleague that the Parliamentary Budget Officer said that the carbon tax would take $10 billion out of the Canadian economy by 2022. Does the member opposite think the Parliamentary Budget Officer is working out of ignorance and fear?

He also said that the carbon tax is the most cost-effective way to cut emissions. If that is true, all we are asking is this: what is the cost, and what is the reduction in emissions?

Mr. Andy Fillmore: Madam Speaker, I also mentioned in my remarks that climate change will cost the Canadian economy $43 billion a year by 2050. Of course pricing carbon pollution has a cost, but that cost is put back into the economy, growing the economy and funding innovation in the green economy as we go along. The fundamental responsibility this generation has to future generations is the possibility of making the polluter pay for the damage being done to our communities.

As a planner, this is very much like a development charge. When we assess developers in a community for the cost of the impact on that community of their new development, that is not a cost borne by the taxpayers at large. It is borne by the person who is creating the cost to the community. That development charge is paid to the community for the benefit of all. That is the core intent of what carbon pollution pricing is all about.

● (1330)

Mr. Arnold Viersen (Peace River—Westlock, CPC): Madam Speaker, if my hon. colleague is so proud of this carbon tax, why will the government not just release what it is going to cost the average Canadian family? He keeps saying that a cost-benefit analysis has been done on this, that the cost will be *x* and the benefit will be *y*, and the *y* will be more than the cost, or the benefit will be more than the cost. If that is indeed the case, why will the government not release these numbers and make the argument that the cost is going to be high, but the benefits will be even better?

Mr. Andy Fillmore: Madam Speaker, as my hon. colleague heard me say in my remarks, it is not knowable what the cost will be yet, because many jurisdictions have yet to devise a system. There is a deadline in place, in September, when all the jurisdictions in Canada will have to have their pricing schemes in place. Otherwise, that will be backstopped by a federal process, but we cannot know those costs until that deadline arrives.

I would add, to revert back to my development charge analogy, that as with development charges, for carbon pricing or pollution pricing, there are some things we know the cost of, such as carbon capture and so forth, but there are many things we have a very hard time putting a figure on, like the impact on the health of our children, for example, or on the ecosystems around the world. These are things that are going to emerge as we understand what the jurisdictional programs look like. At that time, we will be able to understand the cost and the benefits much more clearly.

Mr. Adam Vaughan (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Families, Children and Social Development (Housing and Urban Affairs), Lib.): Madam Speaker, hearing the other side talk about their record on climate change, I wonder how many times one can close a coal plant. The largest reduction in greenhouse gases was a direct result of the provincial government in Ontario closing coal plants. They can only be closed once. They cannot be closed more to get better results. Once it is closed, it is done. One has to move on to another coal plant. By the way, they opposed closing them in Alberta.

The other major contributor to the climate change reduction under the Conservative government, which they like to take credit for, and I am prepared to blame them for it if they wish, is that they had a recession. In fact, they often say it was a global recession, so do not blame them. They loved the recession so much, could the member explain why he thinks they might have wanted to try making a second recession happen just as they were leaving office?

Mr. Andy Fillmore: Madam Speaker, a very positive and unexpected result of the recession was a reduction in carbon. Of course, that was a wonderful silver lining to an otherwise very dark and grubby-looking cloud.

We know that the way we are going to grow our economy and protect our environment is by working on them hand in hand, in step together. The efforts we have across the board, through the infrastructure investments, through the green filter, through investing in green technologies, through the oceans protection plan, and now through a national price on carbon pollution, will work in concert through a whole-of-government approach in a way that every single Canadian has a part to play as we protect our environment for our kids and continue to grow this economy. That will be the legacy of this government.

Mr. Mike Bossio (Hastings—Lennox and Addington, Lib.): Madam Speaker, carbon pricing is key to any credible climate plan, because it is a cost-effective way to significantly reduce pollution while driving clean innovation and creating new jobs. A price on carbon creates a powerful incentive to cut pollution. It encourages people and businesses to save money by making cleaner choices, such as better insulating their homes or upgrading to more efficient equipment. Carbon pricing is a foundation of Canada's clean growth and climate action plan.

Four out of five Canadians live in a jurisdiction that is already pricing pollution today. By ensuring that all parts of Canada price pollution to the same standard, we will help ensure that we drive down our emissions and grow our economy. The clearer, more consistent, strong, and predictable the price signal, the greater its effectiveness in driving the choices that contribute to the transition to a low-carbon economy.

There are three main carbon pricing systems in Canada: cap and trade, a carbon tax or other form of charge on fossil fuels, and a hybrid system. The federal carbon pollution pricing system will use a hybrid approach that consists of two components: a charge on fossil fuels that will generally be paid by fuel producers or distributors, and a performance-based system for industrial facilities. It will be considered to be a regulatory fuel charge, as it will be aimed at changing behaviours. Putting a price on carbon pollution will create an incentive for businesses and consumers to make lower-carbon choices.

● (1335)

Mr. John Brassard: Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I just want to give the member an opportunity to correct the record. He said it is a "carbon tax". His government has been consistently calling it—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): That is a question for debate and not a point of order.

Mr. Mike Bossio: Madam Speaker, I will take a moment to explain these two components in further detail.

Part 1 of the act sets out the details on the fuel charge, which would generally be payable by a fuel distributor or a fuel producer who can be expected to pass on that cost to the end-user of the fuel in the form of an increased purchase price, thereby creating a price signal throughout the Canadian economy. The rates of the fuel charge are set out in schedule 2 of the act. This part will be administered by the Canada Revenue Agency.

Part 2 establishes the performance-based system for industrial facilities with high emissions that are also trade exposed. This system is designed to provide a price signal and incent reductions while minimizing competitiveness in carbon leakage risks. Instead of paying the fuel charge in part 1 on fuels that they purchase, industrial facilities will face a compliance cost on only a portion of their emissions, the amount by which they exceed a regulated limit.

The annual emissions limit for a facility that carries out a regulated activity will be based on an emissions intensity standard for that activity. Standards will generally be in the form of emissions per unit of production. Regulations will set different standards for different activities.

As an example of how this will work, a standard could be set at one tonne of CO2 emissions per unit of production for a particular regulated activity. A facility that carries out the regulated activity would have an annual limit that is equal to one tonne of carbon emissions multiplied by the number of units that the facility produces in that year. This will create an incentive for facilities to produce as efficiently as possible, in other words, to reduce their emissions per unit of production. This will drive energy efficiency and switching to cleaner fuels.

If a facility emits less than the limit, it will receive surplus credits that it can bank for future use or sell to other regulated firms. The system thus creates an incentive for continuous improvement.

Facilities that emit above their limit will need to provide compensation for the portion of their emissions above their annual limit using one of three methods. First, facilities can submit surplus credits that they earned in previous years or acquired from another facility. Second, facilities can submit offset credits from projects that prevent emissions or that remove greenhouse gases from the atmosphere. Third, facilities can pay a charge equivalent to the price of the federal standard carbon price. This price is set at $10 per tonne of carbon dioxide equivalent in 2018 and will rise by $10 annually until it reaches $50 per tonne in 2022.

Facilities will be required to open accounts in a tracking system to buy, sell, and use credits. The tracking system in part 2 will also register payments of the excess emissions charge. The actual performance standards for each sector will be prescribed in regulations. Officials from the Department of Environment and Climate Change are in the process of engaging with industry and other interested stakeholders on the development of these standards.

Wherever the federal carbon pricing system applies, the Government of Canada will return all direct revenue made from the carbon price to the jurisdiction of origin.

Part 1 and part 2 each contain administrative sections, such as provisions on registration, compliance reporting, confidentiality of information, and record-keeping for the proper functioning of the federal system. To ensure timely payment of the carbon price and compliance with the other requirements of the federal system, part 1 and part 2 each contain enforcement provisions, including penalties, offences, and debt collection provisions tailored to the specific component in each part.

The act requires the Minister of Environment and Climate Change to report annually to Parliament on the administration of the act. This is in addition to the commitment in the pan-Canadian framework for annual reports on the overall implementation of the framework and a joint federal-provincial-territorial review of the overall approach to pricing carbon in Canada by early 2022 to confirm the path forward, with an interim review in 2020.

● (1340)

Pricing carbon pollution is one of the key actions that will put Canada on a course to meet our 2030 emissions reduction target, but it is not the only action. Canada's clean growth and climate action plan includes many other measures across the economy that complement carbon pricing to cut emissions. These include phasing out coal-fired power; improving the energy efficiency of buildings, vehicles, and industries; and cutting methane emissions from the oil and gas sector.

The government is also making significant investments to enable Canadian businesses and workers to participate in the trillion-dollar opportunities offered by the world's transition to a clean growth economy. In June 2017, the $1.4 billion low-carbon economy leadership fund was launched to support provincial and territorial projects for buildings, industry, forestry, and agriculture.

In December 2017, the first set of projects was announced and many are now under way. On March 14, 2018, the low-carbon economy challenge was launched. The challenge will provide up to $500 million for projects that generate clean growth and reduce greenhouse gas emissions. Provinces, territories, businesses, municipalities, not-for-profit organizations, and indigenous communities can apply. The government is also investing billions of dollars in green infrastructure and public transit. The Canada Infrastructure Bank and Export Development Canada are using innovative financing mechanisms, like green bonds, to support climate investments and help new technologies become mainstream.

Mr. John Brassard (Barrie—Innisfil, CPC): Madam Speaker, I want to thank you for allowing me to rise on the point of order earlier. I did want to give the member an opportunity to correct the record because he did refer to it as a carbon tax and I certainly would not want Gerry to be mad at him for not referring to it as carbon pricing.

However, the member did speak about direct revenues. Forgive me for being skeptical about having direct revenues go back to the provinces, but it is on the issue of the GST, which is critical. Effectively what the carbon tax plan proposes is that the Liberals continue to charge the GST on the price of the carbon tax, in other words, creating a tax on top of a tax.

Will the Liberal Party keep this money as a means and a way to spend more money? They are going to be collecting more taxes. Are they going to be spending more?

Mr. Mike Bossio: Madam Speaker, we try to deflect from the real issues we are trying to deal with here and that is how we meet our 2030 climate change targets. I am not surprised that members opposite would try to focus on measures that would be fearmongering rather than trying to deal with the real issue.

The question becomes, what are we going to tell our grandchildren and our great-grandchildren? Are we going to say, "We had really good intentions of meeting our goals and we really should have probably paid the cost of the pollution we were creating, but the Americans were not, so why should we? Actually I think we would rather let you guys pay for it in the future"?

That is not good enough for this side of the House. We have a plan, unlike the Conservatives, to actually deal with the crisis that faces our society and I am proud of the plan that we have put forward.

● (1345)

[*Translation*]

Ms. Marjolaine Boutin-Sweet (Hochelaga, NDP): Madam Speaker, something stinks. In 2017, the Prime Minister was awarded the global energy and environment leadership award by the world's largest oil companies. I think that is a clear sign that the government is putting oil extraction ahead of the environment. I would like to know when that will stop.

[*English*]

Mr. Mike Bossio: Madam Speaker, on this side of the House we are focused on actually dealing with the long-term goals that we have set as a government and that is that the economy and the environment have to go hand in hand. We cannot say it is all going to be the economy and we cannot say it is all going to be the environment because that is not going to suit the long-term needs of Canadians. If we blow up the economy so that we can deal with our emissions today, then that is not going to serve the interests of Canadians in the long run.

We have a plan. It is a multi-faceted plan that takes into consideration investments in public transit, innovation, water and sewer. It is trying to minimize our emissions while at the same time making strategic investments that are going to grow our economy to the benefit of all Canadians, and creating great jobs. As has been pointed out many times, this government has created over 600,000 jobs since being elected and has the highest growth in the G7. I think we have the right balance with our plan.

Mr. Dan Albas (Central Okanagan—Similkameen—Nicola, CPC): Madam Speaker, obviously, this national carbon tax is going to be imposed on places like Saskatchewan and Nunavut. In Nunavut, 80% of the diesel that is used to generate heat for housing is paid for by the government. The Premier of Nunavut has said that this plan will not work.

Saskatchewan has its own plan to make its own climate goals that are dedicated toward the Paris Agreement. Why does the member think he should be telling Saskatchewan how it should be dealing with climate change?

Mr. Mike Bossio: Madam Speaker, we came out with a pan-Canadian framework that all provinces agreed to. Eighty per cent of Canadians, right now, have a price on carbon that is at a certain level. We feel that all Canadians should have the same price on carbon. We are all polluting, and we should pay for that pollution today and not put that burden on future generations. I think that for any Canadian in this country, the basis of our being is that we believe in fairness. We believe in justice. We believe in paying our fair share for the pollution we are creating today, for the benefit of future generations. You talk about debt going on to future generations. This is a massive debt that you are trying to throw to future generations. That is why I am so surprised the Conservatives are taking the position they are on this issue.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): I am not throwing anything at anybody. I want to remind the member that he is to address any questions and comments to the Chair.

Resuming debate, the hon. member for Peace River—Westlock.

Mr. Arnold Viersen (Peace River—Westlock, CPC): Madam Speaker, I am pleased to rise today to speak to this opposition motion. This motion is about transparency, but it is also about the lack of clarity by the government on this carbon tax.

I want to talk a bit about how the carbon tax affects my riding of Peace River—Westlock in northern Alberta. Northern Alberta is a pretty cold place. There are about five days a year over 30°C and the rest of the year is much colder than that. There is about a four-month growing season and beyond that, it is winter, still winter, and almost winter. Those are three seasons in northern Alberta.

When it comes to what the carbon tax costs average Canadian families, my region will be affected more than others because furnaces there run more than anywhere else in the country. In Alberta, natural gas has gone up by one-quarter of the price. It was $3 a gigajoule before and now it is $4 a gigajoule. That translates to hundreds of dollars more every month for heat in northern Alberta, and that is the direct cost to families in heat alone.

The gentleman who spoke before me talked about how the carbon tax would be a direct cost of $500 per family. That is the direct cost, just on heating bills. In northern Alberta, the carbon tax is much more than $500 per family, but maybe that is the average for all of Canada. That seems fair as a direct cost. We do not know, however, because the government has redacted the entire document that the finance department created for this new initiative for a carbon tax in Canada.

It is the other things that trickle down that have a detrimental effect not only on individual Canadian families but our entire economy. The thing about the carbon tax is that it will be put on heating and transportation. Then and there, that makes everything more expensive.

The government runs around and says that it stands up for supply management and the steel industry in Canada, yet it does not seem to realize that a carbon tax will affect all of these communities and industries significantly.

Before I go any further, I forgot to mention that I would love to share my time with the member for Barrie—Innisfil.

I was recently in Sault Ste. Marie. The carbon tax there is a significant competitive disadvantage for the steel industry. The natural gas that goes to Sault Ste. Marie to heat the steel comes from western Canada. It is imperative that the steel industry in Sault Ste. Marie is viable because a huge amount of natural gas from western Canada is sold to Sault Ste. Marie to heat the steel that is used in northern Alberta to drill in the oil patch and produce energy for the entire world.

The cost of the carbon tax is then translated throughout the economy on percentages. Doing business is all about margins and people calculate the margins based on their costs. When the costs increase, margins increase because it is typically a percentage of the cost. When suppliers to particular industries have the increased cost of the carbon tax, they will all increase their rates. We have seen this in Alberta with the trucking companies. When the carbon tax came in, some companies increased their rates by 8%, other companies just added a fuel surcharge, and others added the carbon tax in their basic rates. Shipping to my area is 8% more expensive.

Garbage collection in the town of Falher went up 8%. The town had to redo its budget because the garbage collection company said that the quote it submitted was no longer good because it had to pay the carbon tax. The Town of Whitecourt said that just heating its publicly owned buildings was going to cost $100,000 more a year, just in heat alone. That is exactly why we need—

● (1350)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): One moment please, there is a point of order. The hon. parliamentary secretary to the government House leader.

* * *

POINTS OF ORDER

DRAFT APPROPRIATION BILL—MAIN ESTIMATES, 2018-19

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I apologize to my friend across the way, but it is a point of order that I need to get on the record right away.

I rise to respond to the point of order raised earlier today by my hon. colleague, the member for Edmonton West, in regard to the language of the draft appropriation bill and vote 40. I would like to draw your attention, Madam Speaker, to Standing Order 81(21), which reads as follows:

> The adoption of any motion to concur in any estimate or estimates shall be an Order of the House to bring in a bill or bills based thereon.

I want to emphasize the words, "bills based thereon". Similar language is also found in Standing Order 83(4). It states:

> The adoption of any Ways and Means motion shall be an order to bring in a bill or bills based on the provisions of any such motion or to propose an amendment or amendments to a bill then before the House, provided that such amendment or amendments are otherwise admissible.

I would reiterate, "a bill or bills based on the provisions of any such motion". This bill is entirely based on the estimates and entirely consistent with our long-standing tradition of financial procedure in this place. Therefore, we believe it to be in proper form. I look forward to your ruling, Madam Speaker.

● (1355)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): I appreciate the additional information that the parliamentary secretary has provided. We will certainly take it under advisement as we deliberate on the previous information that was received.

* * *

BUSINESS OF SUPPLY

OPPOSITION MOTION—CARBON PRICING

The House resumed consideration of the motion.

Mr. Arnold Viersen (Peace River—Westlock, CPC): Madam Speaker, I understand why the Liberals would want to interrupt my great speech. I was telling them exactly how this carbon tax was affecting my northern Alberta communities.

This carbon tax will cost Canadians exponentially, as I was explaining earlier, particularly around the trucking costs. Up in northern Alberta, bringing food in is a significant cost, often because the food will sit on the truck for eight or nine hours.

That says nothing about what the carbon tax will cost our farmers. One of the major inputs to our farmers is both the fuel and the fertilizer. Both of these things will have significant amounts of carbon tax on them. This will make it so our food is more expensive.

I do not know if members know this, but all our food is grown by farmers across Canada. It is important that our farmers maintain viability. When a carbon tax is put on our farmers, they are placed at a competitive disadvantage with farmers around the world. We are already at somewhat of a competitive disadvantage just given the location in which we live. It is a cold climate and not as many things grow in northern Alberta as in some of the other places in the world. However, we have a thriving agriculture sector, yet the Liberals are imposing a carbon tax on farmers and, at the same time, saying they stand up for farmers.

One of the huge costs to farming is the fuel, and we see a significant increase in the fuel costs, never mind the heating. When the crops come off the field and are a bit too wet, we have to dry them out, and that uses a lot of natural gas and propane. If we increase the cost of natural gas by a complete quarter, 25%, that is a huge cost that will be borne out by our farmers. They say that the farmers might be able to manage this, that they might be able to remain viable. Sure, they will probably increase the price of their product, but what does is make food across the country more expensive.

If the Liberals were actually trying to make lives better for the average, everyday Canadian in the middle class, and those working hard to join it, as the Liberals continually trumpet, they would not be imposing a carbon tax. That, in and of itself, proves the point that we need to know what this carbon tax will cost the average, everyday Canadian. The Liberals have blacked that out on the document we have been provided, and are unwilling to tell Canadians what the benefits of the carbon tax are and what it will cost everyday Canadians.

The Speaker: The hon. member for Peace River—Westlock will have two minutes to complete his comments if he wishes, following question period.

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

[*English*]

INDIGENOUS LANGUAGES

Ms. Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP):

[*Member spoke in SENCOTEN*].

Mr. Speaker,

I hope I did not do too much damage to the language of the W_SÁNEC people to say, "honour, thank you", and thanks to the Algonquin people on whose territory we are now taking place in debate today.

I want to recognize indigenous languages, particularly the hard work that has been done by SENCOTEN-speaking people from within Saanich—Gulf Islands and surrounding communities.

The Coast Salish languages are precious. They are an integral part of identity, culture, and of our heritage. In speaking SENCOTEN , I want to particularly recognize that the first SENCOTEN dictionary will be released on August 22. It is a milestone.

I want to thank the work of the First People's Cultural Council and of all SENCOTEN-speaking people throughout Saanich—Gulf Islands.

HÍSW_?E

* * *

[*Translation*]

FLEUR BLEUE HERITAGE ACHIEVEMENT AWARD

Mr. Jean Rioux (Saint-Jean, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, every year, the Musée du Haut-Richelieu awards its Prix du mérite patrimonial Fleur bleue.

I would like to congratulate Georges Coulombe, who won a special tribute award for helping to maintain our cultural heritage by restoring a number of heritage buildings.

Alain Paquette won the individual achievement award for his historical reference work on our region's businesses.

The Musée du Fort Saint-Jean has worked hard over the past few years to develop original activities that showcase regional history and our garrison town heritage. It won the organizational achievement award.

The jury's choice award went to Domaine Trinity, a major restoration project that transformed several heritage buildings.

I would like to congratulate all these passionate people who have helped preserve and share the history and heritage of the riding of Saint-Jean.

* * *

● (1400)

[*English*]

NATIONAL LACROSSE LEAGUE

Mr. Kevin Waugh (Saskatoon—Grasswood, CPC): Mr. Speaker, this past Saturday, the Saskatchewan Rush celebrated yet another historic win as they knocked off the Rochester Knighthawks to capture the National Lacrosse League championship for the second time in three years.

Over 13,600 spectators began chanting 20 minutes before the game, "We want the cup". Led by head coach Derek Keenan, the Rush took the final game 15-10, with a flurry of four goals in the fourth quarter. The Rush were led by most valuable players, Jeff Shattler and Mark Matthews. Perhaps, though, no one is happier about this victory than super fan Joyce Souka, a.k.a. Grandma Rush.

The whole the province is behind this team, and we could not be more proud. I congratulate the the NLL champs, the Saskatchewan Rush.

* * *

VIOLENCE AGAINST HEALTH CARE WORKERS

Mr. Doug Eyolfson (Charleswood—St. James—Assiniboia—Headingley, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, last month, I met with Sandi Mowat of the Manitoba Nurses Union to discuss the rising tide of violence against health care workers.

As an emergency room physician for 20 years, I would regularly be exposed to violence, even on two occasions having been assaulted myself. However, 61% of nurses reported abuse, harassment, or assault on the job over a one-year period, leading many to suffer from the effects of PTSD. From 2006 to 2015, there were nearly 17,000 violence-related lost-time claims for health care workers. In 2016, absenteeism for full-time nurses due to illness or injury cost Canada nearly $1 billion.

It is evident that there is a need for federal engagement on this issue, which is why I introduced a motion in the health committee to study and develop recommendations on actions that the federal government could take to improve violence prevention in health care.

I would like to thank Sandi for all her work as president of the Manitoba Nurses Union, and I look forward to working with my colleagues on the committee to address this issue.

* * *

CANADA REVENUE AGENCY

Mr. Daniel Blaikie (Elmwood—Transcona, NDP): Mr. Speaker, many people in Elmwood—Transcona are frustrated by their treatment at the hands of the Canada Revenue Agency. My office regularly hears from people who, when trying, in good faith, to get the information they need to file and pay their taxes, have not been able to get through to the CRA. They cannot see a CRA agent in person, they cannot leave a message on the phone, and do not even have the option of waiting on hold. However, if they make a mistake on their tax return, they are shown no leniency.

While hard-working people in Elmwood—Transcona are getting the runaround from the CRA, CEOs and millionaires are getting off the hook. The government has not closed the CEO stock option loophole. It continues to sign sweetheart tax treaties that allow the rich to avoid paying their fair share. KPMG has not suffered any consequences for its role in orchestrating an elaborate tax-dodging scheme.

People are tired of seeing the wealthy and well-connected bending the rules to their advantage, while everybody else is told to fall in line.

It does not have to be this way. A government with the political will to stand up for working people would fix these problems. If the government will not do it, the NDP will.

* * *

[*Translation*]

MADAWASKA—RESTIGOUCHE

Mr. René Arseneault (Madawaska—Restigouche, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, with summer fast approaching, communities all across my riding will be hosting festivals, activities, and powwows. There will be something for everyone.

[*English*]

However, the strength of my riding resides in its open spaces, and in the beauty of its lakes, forests, and rivers. We live in the heart of the Appalachians, and nature lovers can take advantage of three beautiful mountains.

Statements by Members

[*Translation*]

Mont Farlagne in Edmunston is a ski destination in winter, but in summer, its trails are the place to be for avid cyclists.

Sugarloaf Mountain in Atholville won the title of best downhill bike park in eastern Canada. In July, it will host the Adrenaline Bike Festival.

The last one I want to mention is Mount Carleton, the highest peak in the Maritimes. Located in the vicinity of Saint-Quentin and Kedgwick, it is a Royal Astronomical Society of Canada-designated dark sky preserve.

● (1405)

[*English*]

I invite all my colleagues and all Canadians to come and visit the Madawaska—Restigouche riding, our beautiful corner of Canada.

[*Translation*]

I wish everyone a great summer.

* * *

[*English*]

HOCKEY NIGHT IN BARRIE

Mr. Alexander Nuttall (Barrie—Springwater—Oro-Medonte, CPC): Mr. Speaker, along with the member for Barrie—Innisfil, I am proud and pleased to announce that Hockey Night in Barrie is happening again this year at the Barrie Molson Centre on August 9.

Over the past 11 years, Hockey Night in Barrie has raised over $2 million. In the past, the money has gone directly to the RVH in Barrie, and to other great hospitals around the region. The money has been used for cancer care and the Hearts & Minds campaign.

This year, the money will be used for the prenatal and postnatal intensive care units at the RVH, Easter Seals, the Canadian Mental Health Association, and the Barrie Colts Community Fund. These charities do tremendous work in our community, and we are very happy to be supporting them.

Every year, Hockey Night in Barrie gets bigger and better, and this year will be no exception. Over the next few weeks we will be announcing another all-star lineup.

I would like to thank all the volunteers who make this event such a success. As well, I would like to thank Patrick Brown, who started this 11 years ago and has turned Hockey Night in Barrie into one of the premier charity events in the country.

We are looking forward to another sold-out game, and we hope to see everyone there.

* * *

ARMED FORCES DAY IN NORTH BAY

Mr. Anthony Rota (Nipissing—Timiskaming, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, yesterday my hometown of North Bay, Ontario, hosted the eighth annual Armed Forces Day. It is an opportunity to celebrate the important relationship between the city's military and civilian communities. It is one of the largest celebrations of its kind in Canada, with air demonstrations and ground displays.

I am proud to say that 22 Wing North Bay is the centre of Canada's North American Aerospace Defense Command operations, better known as NORAD, the important binational organization that monitors and defends North America.

[*Translation*]

This year marks the 60th anniversary of NORAD, making this year's event even more significant. It is an opportunity for us to honour our past, protect our present, and secure our future.

[*English*]

Canadian and American NORAD personnel, along with civilian personnel, work side by side on this important mission.

On behalf of our city and our country, I would like to salute the men and women who ensure our safety, and thank them for keeping North America strong and free.

* * *

PRIDE MONTH

Hon. Hedy Fry (Vancouver Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in 1993, I ran on a promise of LGBTQ2+ equality in law and in fact. As a physician, I had seen how discrimination affected my patients. This Pride month, in the so-called "Year of the Queer", I reflect on what pride means to this community: the ability to stand, after lifetimes in the closet, as equal citizens, and openly declare, "We are here, we are queer, and we are proud of it."

The roots of pride date back to New York's Stonewall protests in June 1969, when drag queens took to the streets after one too many police raids, in an act of pride and defiance.

Across Canada, cities will host parades to celebrate LGBTQ2+ pride. Vancouver's 40th parade is on August 5. This will be my 26th year of participation. As a wannabe diva, I will dance, costumed, in the parade, in eight-inch heels. I am prepping my costume now. I will be proud to walk with the LGBTQ2+ community.

Happy Pride Month.

* * *

MARIJUANA

Mr. Dean Allison (Niagara West, CPC): Mr. Speaker, my colleague, the member for Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo, recently tabled Bill C-330. This bill intended to give property owners more say as to whether or not marijuana can be produced on their properties. The Liberals voted against it.

It is known that marijuana odours negatively affect property values and the quality of life for other residents. My constituents in the town of Pelham are concerned about strong odours from a local marijuana production facility. The smell is overpowering from as far as one kilometre away. The local municipality and Health Canada are debating jurisdiction, and because of this nothing is being done.

The Liberals are trying to pass a marijuana bill in a hurry, while ignoring all the warning signs and failing to deal with the potential consequences of a rushed legislation. In their rush, they have left landlords and residents with no protection.

My constituents are asking for clear rules and the ability to enforce these rules with respect to marijuana production, even more so now that recreational marijuana is right around the corner. All Canadians deserve to have a say in their communities.

* * *

KIDNEY DIALYSIS TREATMENT

Ms. Kim Rudd (Northumberland—Peterborough South, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge the efforts of Mr. Kenneth Sharp, a constituent of Port Hope in my riding of Northumberland—Peterborough South, who is considered to be the longest-living kidney dialysis patient in the world. Mr. Sharp has been working for several years to secure government funding for a bioartificial kidney implant whose technology requires no injection drugs.

This project was initially spearheaded by Mr. Sharp with former Peterborough member of Parliament Peter Adams, and now there is an ongoing effort to secure partnership with the University of California at San Francisco.

Mr. Sharp is indeed a force to be reckoned with. It is with great pleasure that the member for Peterborough—Kawartha and I honour and commend Mr. Sharp for his efforts in making this cutting-edge dialysis treatment available across North America. We know that the 60,000 Canadians currently receiving dialysis owe a debt of thanks to Mr. Sharp and former MP Adams for their tireless efforts on behalf of those who face the hardship of renal disease.

* * *

●(1410)

NATIONAL PUBLIC SERVICE WEEK

Mr. John Aldag (Cloverdale—Langley City, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Canada has more than 260,000 remarkable public servants who work tirelessly to keep the federal government running, day and night, year-round. Our federal public service is diverse, talented, and passionate. This week, during National Public Service Week, we celebrate their hard work and dedication.

In the communities of Surrey and Langley, which I have the honour to represent, our public servants deliver front-line services, ensuring that Canadians are provided the highest quality of service.

Before being elected as a member of Parliament, I served in the federal public service for more than 30 years. I am proud to have served with amazing and talented colleagues who continue to preserve and protect the best of Canada's natural and cultural heritage in Parks Canada locations from coast to coast to coast, for Canadians and international visitors alike.

During National Public Service Week I would like to salute our federal public servants and thank them for the amazing work they do on behalf of and for Canadians.

CANADA SUMMER JOBS PROGRAM

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs (Lakeland, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister put a values test on the Canada summer jobs program, ending funding to groups who care for seniors, refugees, and at-risk youth, while killing jobs for students. This test attacks secular and faith-based non-profits alike.

Meanwhile, the Liberals approved Canada summer jobs funds for a position to "stop the Kinder Morgan pipeline and tanker project" and for Leadnow, which runs campaigns to both block the Trans Mountain expansion and defeat Conservatives in elections across Canada.

People in Lakeland oppose the values test. The Amblers emailed me, and they call on the Liberals to "remove this discriminatory requirement and allow Canadians to continue to exercise their freedom of religion and freedom of expression without facing institutionalized discrimination".

As always, the Liberals' actions speak so much louder than their empty words. They are attacking fundamental rights and oil and gas jobs, using tax dollars for their own partisan gain, and dividing and failing Canadians. Their values test shows they do not actually believe in equality, diversity, tolerance, and inclusion at all, and they should remove it.

* * *

BLOOD DONATION

Ms. Ruby Sahota (Brampton North, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, today, June 14, is World Blood Donor Day. I rise today to raise awareness of the existing demand for blood products like platelets, plasma, and red blood cells. Although half of all Canadians are eligible to donate, only 4% do. That means over 100,000 new donors are needed every year to meet the current demand.

Last year, nearly 406,000 people donated blood at Canadian Blood Services sites. We thank each and every one of them. Donating blood is a genuine act of altruism and represents a truly selfless gift.

The theme of this year's World Blood Donor Day is, "Be there for someone else. Give blood. Share life." It encourages donations as an act of solidarity with others, and it unites communities. In this spirit, I encourage the residents of Brampton North, and also my fellow members of Parliament, to donate blood and give the gift of life.

* * *

ESTUARY RESTORATION

Mr. Gord Johns (Courtenay—Alberni, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the Kus-kus-sum project in my riding is a model of co-operation between residents in the Comox Valley, the K'ómoks people, the City of Courtenay, and the Comox Valley Regional District. They are working in partnership with the private sector and charitable foundations to restore the K'ómoks estuary after decades of industrial contamination at the former Field sawmill site.

The Project Watershed stewardship society has purchased the site, which has been given the name Kus-kus-sum by the K'ómoks elders. Co-operation in this project continues, even after the sale has been completed. Its ownership will be assumed jointly by the City of Courtenay and the K'ómoks people.

The restoration of Kus-kus-sum as a vibrant and productive fish habitat is critical for recreation, tourism, and the local economy. This is a big job with big deadlines, and a true example of reconciliation in action. For this project to succeed, all levels of government must pull together in co-operation. Now is the time for the federal government to fund this co-operative project.

* * *

● (1415)

INTERNATIONAL TRADE

Mr. Colin Carrie (Oshawa, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Liberals have implemented major policy changes that have hurt Canadian competitiveness. Unbelievably, we learned the Liberals have made absolutely no room in their budget to support those affected by the trade war on Canadian steel and aluminum.

Uncertainty kills jobs. The Liberals said they had a plan. They promised they had consulted with Canadian industries. They promised to avoid unintended consequences and job losses, yet we could soon see the latest victims of the Liberal anti-competitive policies.

Oshawa families are worried. Automakers in Oshawa will be required to pay tariffs on speciality steel imported from the United States in order to build cars to North American standards. These tariffs will hurt everyone. We need to do everything we can to help.

The good news is some leaders get it. The premier designate of Ontario understands that American plants do not have to pay the Prime Minister's carbon tax, so he is immediately cancelling Ontario's carbon tax.

Will the Prime Minister follow Mr. Ford's lead and cancel his anti-competitive carbon tax so that manufacturers at least have a fighting chance to keep jobs in Oshawa?

* * *

RAMADAN

Mrs. Deborah Schulte (King—Vaughan, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, during the holy month of Ramadan, Muslims in King—Vaughan and across Canada have been fasting from dusk to dawn, devoted to faith, reflection, and the service of the less fortunate. Eid al-Fitr will mark the end of this 30-day spiritual journey. It will be a day that brings together friends, families, and communities in special prayer, gratitude for blessings, and celebratory meals.

From iftars hosted by the Vaughan Islamic Community Centre, Masjid Vaughan, and the Jaffari Community Centre to the Fast with a Muslim Friend campaign and the iftar dinner on the Hill last night, hosted by the Ahmadiyya Muslim community, King Township and Vaughan are witness to the shared Canadian values of generosity and peace that this month of Ramadan demonstrates.

I wish peace and prosperity to all those celebrating.

[*Member spoke in Arabic*]

ORAL QUESTIONS

[*Translation*]

MARIJUANA

Mr. Gérard Deltell (Louis-Saint-Laurent, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Liberal government wants to implement marijuana legalization as quickly as possible, which is really not a good thing. Another one of the Liberals' rubbish ideas is to allow the cultivation of four pot plants in every household in Canada. Fortunately, the Liberal government's mad obsession is going to hit a wall, since two provinces, Quebec and Manitoba, are opposed.

Can this Liberal government respect jurisdictions and respect the provinces?

Hon. Ginette Petitpas Taylor (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, protecting the health and safety of Canadians is a top priority for our government. Home cultivation will continue to displace the illegal market and will also create a legal source of cannabis for people who do not have easy access to it through a provincial or territorial store or an online platform. We are also following the advice of the task force on cannabis legalization and regulation and the approach taken by most of the jurisdictions that have legalized cannabis in the United States.

Mr. Gérard Deltell (Louis-Saint-Laurent, CPC): Mr. Speaker, what lack of respect. I am not the one who said that. It was the Quebec Liberal minister, Jean-Marc Fournier, who is proudly fighting tooth and nail for provincial governments.

Quebec and Manitoba do not want marijuana to be grown at home. It is sad to say, but the reality is that the government is doing what it wants and not listening to anyone. The government did not listen to first nations and it is not listening to Quebec and Manitoba.

Can the Prime Minister at least guarantee one thing, that no pot will be grown at 24 Sussex?

Hon. Ginette Petitpas Taylor (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, our government is legalizing cannabis, strictly regulating it, and limiting access to prevent our youth from getting their hands on it. We also want to prevent organized crime from profiting. The current approach to cannabis is not working. It has allowed criminals to profit and, once again, makes it a lot easier for our young people to buy cannabis than cigarettes. That is why our government consulted experts, police chiefs, and many others. We are moving forward with a bill to protect our young people.

[*English*]

FISHERIES AND OCEANS

Hon. Lisa Raitt (Milton, CPC): Mr. Speaker, right now, fishermen are assembling a blockade of lobster traps outside the office of the member of Parliament for Acadie—Bathurst. They are doing this because of the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans' extreme decision to close the lobster fishery in the Gulf of St. Lawrence. Now, the minister knows that a decision like this is going to have a serious financial impact on the families there, especially after his rule change that happened at the end of April.

Why does it have to come to a blockade to get this minister's attention?

● (1420)

Hon. Dominic LeBlanc (Minister of Fisheries, Oceans and the Canadian Coast Guard, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I cannot imagine my Conservative colleague would suggest that we not take the most robust measures necessary to protect the North Atlantic right whale, because she will understand, as all Canadians do, that protecting the North Atlantic right whale is vital to ensuring continued access to international markets for over $6 billion of Canadian fish and seafood exports. We understand that this decision is difficult. We understand that fishers and plant workers will be concerned. That is why I have the privilege of meeting representatives tomorrow in New Brunswick, and will continue to work with them to ensure they are protected.

* * *

CARBON PRICING

Hon. Lisa Raitt (Milton, CPC): Mr. Speaker, for weeks, the Liberals have refused to tell Canadians how much their carbon tax is going to cost them. To use the Prime Minister's own words, this is very "insulting" to Canadians. They have been completely straightforward with the fact that they intend to proceed with the carbon tax, but when it comes to telling us exactly how much it is going to cost, they are eerily silent. Voters in Ontario have spoken, and what they said at the ballot box was that they do not want to have a carbon tax.

The Liberals have a chance today. Will they at least tell us how much it is going to cost families?

Hon. Catherine McKenna (Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we published a report on April 30 doing exactly that. It talks about pricing pollution. It talks about the 80 million to 90 million tonnes, the equivalent of taking 25 million cars off the road, that pricing achieves. We believe provinces are best placed to decide what to do with revenues. We have been clear revenues will stay in the province. Eighty per cent of Canadians live in a province where they have a price on pollution. They have given back money in tax cuts, in rebates. They have invested in clean innovation. They should go ask those provinces what they are doing with their revenues.

Hon. Lisa Raitt (Milton, CPC): Mr. Speaker, what I am asking this minister is for her to tell us what her department officials told her is the cost to Canadian families for their carbon tax. She knows what the answer is.

Breaking news, today we understand why Ontarians actually voted for Doug Ford in the election in Ontario. They said that voters feel that costs are out of control, and they view carbon taxes as nothing more than a cash grab. Why will these MPs not at least tell voters in Canada how much of their cash they intend on grabbing?

Hon. Catherine McKenna (Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I do not know how much clearer I can be. All revenues from pricing go back to the provinces. It is up to provinces to decide what to do.

Let us talk about the economy. Let us talk about the 600,000 jobs that our government created with Canadians. Let us talk about the lowest unemployment rate in generations. Let us talk about how we can take serious action on climate change and we can grow our economy. The previous government could do neither.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Speaker: There is no need for so much noise. Hon. members know they are required to not interrupt in the House when someone else has the floor. The time to speak is when they have the floor. Each side gets its chance to take part in debate. We wait until we have our turn.

[*Translation*]

The hon. member for Rimouski-Neigette—Témiscouata—Les Basques.

* * *

[*English*]

NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. Guy Caron (Rimouski-Neigette—Témiscouata—Les Basques, NDP): Mr. Speaker, David Dodge, the former governor of the Bank of Canada, said yesterday that people might die protesting the Trans Mountain expansion project and that we will basically just have to deal with that. I am really surprised I have to say this in the House, but the right to protest peacefully is protected by the Canadian Charter of Rights and is fundamental to our democracy.

Will the government condemn David Dodge's comments, or does it agree with him that the pipeline must go through at any cost, including the lives of peaceful protesters?

Hon. Catherine McKenna (Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, our government believes in the right of peaceful protest.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Guy Caron (Rimouski-Neigette—Témiscouata—Les Basques, NDP): That is not very reassuring, Mr. Speaker. I would like a more comprehensive answer. I remember in this place, in December 2016, the Minister of Natural Resources said that peaceful pipeline protesters would be met by the Canadian Armed Forces. After hearing such comments from a cabinet member, I am worried to hear a senior official like David Dodge suggesting that peaceful protesters be killed.

I want the government not only to acknowledge that peaceful civil disobedience is a fundamental democratic tool, but also to denounce David Dodge's comments.

● (1425)

Hon. Catherine McKenna (Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we believe in Canadians' right to legal, peaceful protests.

Mr. Alexandre Boulerice (Rosemont—La Petite-Patrie, NDP): Mr. Speaker, today, we learned in a study by Équiterre that pipeline management in this country is all over the map.

In 2017, there was a 41% increase in incidents, spills, leaks, and issues. The so-called automated detection systems do not detect even half of what happens. What happens when companies get caught? Nothing. The notices of violation and orders are systematically ignored, and no one loses their licence.

When will the government clean up its act and bring oil companies in line?

Hon. Marc Garneau (Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, all governments are responsible for getting resources to market, but they must also ensure that they follow safety rules and environmental protection regulations.

The Pipeline Safety Act strengthens Canada's safety system by enshrining the polluter pays principle in federal legislation. Operators will be held accountable and will have to respond to any incidents, regardless of who is at fault.

[*English*]

Ms. Sheila Malcolmson (Nanaimo—Ladysmith, NDP): Mr. Speaker, as Liberals put billions into Kinder Morgan, betraying their promised sunny ways renewable future, pipeline spills and accidents are rising. Equiterre's new report on oil pipeline safety found less than 50% of incidents are reported. The National Energy Board is "not capable" of handling the work on its plate and is not protecting citizens or the environment.

Why did the government buy a leaky old pipeline, knowing these risks? How will it police itself when the next leak happens?

Hon. Marc Garneau (Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as I have just said, it is a duty of government to make sure that we get our resources to market and that is precisely what we are doing.

At the same time, anyone who is responsible for a pipeline must understand that our principle of polluter pay applies and anyone who is responsible for it must take care of any incidents that do occur.

* * *

CARBON PRICING

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Carleton, CPC): Mr. Speaker, when I reported to the House that the Fraser Institute had calculated that 81% of middle-class taxpayers were paying more under the Liberal government, the Prime Minister said, "No, that report did not say any such thing", prompting the authors of the report to go to the newspapers and say, "Yes, most middle-class families are paying more in income tax." We cannot trust the government on taxes.

We ask the government to come clean and tell us how much this carbon tax will cost these same middle-class families.

Hon. Catherine McKenna (Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am going to keep on saying the same thing. We published a report on April 30. I am happy to personally give it to the member opposite. What does it say? It says that pricing pollution works. It says that it reduces emissions by 80 million to 90 million tonnes and that we have been clear that revenues will go back into the provinces they come from. Eighty per cent of Canadians live in Ontario, Quebec, Alberta, or B.C. where there is a price on pollution. The member can ask those provinces what they do with the revenues, but for example, British Columbia gives the revenues back in tax cuts.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Speaker: Order. The hon. member for Abbotsford will come to order please.

The hon. member for Carleton.

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Carleton, CPC): Mr. Speaker, we are not asking for their April public relations pamphlet. We are asking for the costing that the departments have already done on this. We are calling on the government to release all costing documents that any department has produced or shared internally since the last election day. That is the only way we will know the real cost of this carbon tax.

Will the minister and the government release all of those documents, unredacted, so that Canadians know what this tax will cost?

Hon. Catherine McKenna (Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am going to talk to Canadians. You should go to provinces and ask what provinces are going to do with the revenue. There is a lot of misinformation here, misinformation from the other side. All revenues will stay in the province and the provinces can give back the revenues as tax cuts. What Canadians really want to know is what the Conservative Party's climate plan is.

● (1430)

The Speaker: Members know about the rule that members should address the Chair. It is designed to avoid members referring to one another as "you" and so forth, but it is best to keep to that rule in general.

The hon. member for Carleton.

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Carleton, CPC): Mr. Speaker, as the Liberals are looking forward to getting to some beautiful cottage on some lake, Canadians are suffering under the burden of higher gas prices, prices as high as $1.60 a litre in some provinces, prices that will only rise further when the Liberal government imposes its carbon tax. We want to know the price.

If the government is going to make Canadians pay the price, we are going to make the government pay the price by keeping them here for 25 hours straight voting on this carbon tax cover-up.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Speaker: Order. Members seem to be very excited about that 24-hour prospect.

The hon. Minister of Environment.

Hon. Catherine McKenna (Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we do not have to go through a stunt like the Conservatives are going to pull because we have already answered the question.

Eighty per cent of Canadians live in a province where the province has decided what to do with the revenues. The revenues have gone back in tax cuts or into investment in clean innovation. We have been clear that provinces are best placed to decide what to do with the revenues. Once again, what Canadians want to know is what the Conservatives' climate change plan is.

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Carleton, CPC): Mr. Speaker, we know the Liberals claim they are going to collect all this tax and then give it to provincial politicians. That is not our question. We are asking how much the tax will cost. If it had nothing to do with the federal government, it would not be in the federal budget bill. They have written a bill asking the House for permission to raise taxes on Canadians, but they will not even tell us what that tax will cost. There is no taxation without information. When will they give us the information on the cost of—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

Hon. Catherine McKenna (Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, once again, I refer to the April 30 document that provides the information.

However, let us talk about what we have done. We have created historic numbers of jobs for Canadians. We have the lowest unemployment rate in generations. We cut taxes on the middle class and raised them on the top 1%. We have given money back to Canadians through the Canada child benefit so that nine out of 10 families are better off and we have raised 300,000 kids out of poverty. That is real action. We are going to continue taking real action on climate change and growing our economy. I wish the other party would join us.

Hon. Michelle Rempel (Calgary Nose Hill, CPC): Mr. Speaker, if we take an intersectional gender lens to the cost of the carbon tax, it is arguable that low-income women, particularly senior women and single mothers, will bear the disproportionate cost of the carbon tax.

The Prime Minister has said that poverty is sexist. He knows, he has the data on how much it is going to cost these lower-income women. When will he end this carbon tax cover-up?

Hon. Maryam Monsef (Minister of Status of Women, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we are thrilled to see the Conservatives take an interest in gender equality. This is what real change looks like.

I would like to remind the hon. member that we gave more funds to families who need the support the most, with the Canada child benefit. They voted against it.

I would like to remind her that we lowered taxes for the middle class and raised them on the 1%. They voted against it.

We are introducing pay equity legislation. They have worked every step of the way to stop that process.

We are supporting women and families with child benefit and child care opportunities. They voted against it.

Hon. Michelle Rempel (Calgary Nose Hill, CPC): Mr. Speaker, real change looks like imposing a tax grab that does nothing to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, which they know, while imposing a tax that is going to disproportionately harm low-income women. That is real change that no Canadian wants.

The government is not providing Canadians representation as they are increasing their taxes. They have this data. Why are they hiding it from Canadians?

● (1435)

Hon. Maryam Monsef (Minister of Status of Women, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, through the Canada child benefit plan, nine out of 10 Canadian families are better off under our plan than they were under the Conservatives plan. If my hon. colleagues are truly concerned about the well-being of those working hard to join the middle class, why do they take the opportunity at every step of the way to vote against plans and programs we introduce?

We have a housing strategy for 10 years, $40 billion, at least 25% of which will support women and their families with low incomes. My hon. colleague can jump on board and support our plan to grow the middle class.

* * *

[*Translation*]

INTERNATIONAL TRADE

Ms. Ruth Ellen Brosseau (Berthier—Maskinongé, NDP): Mr. Speaker, after the Prime Minister said he was flexible, it is now the Minister of Agriculture who is leaving the door wide open to the possibility of sacrificing our supply management system in NAFTA renegotiations.

The Liberals keep telling us in the House that they are defending supply management and that they are the party that brought it in. They need to walk the talk.

My question is simple: will the government fully defend supply management in NAFTA renegotiations, yes or no? The key word here is "fully".

Mr. Jean-Claude Poissant (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, our government strongly supports supply management and is committed to maintaining it.

The Prime Minister, the Minister of Agriculture, the Minister of Foreign Affairs, our entire Cabinet and the entire caucus, as well as Canada's trade negotiators, have been very clear and unequivocal on this since NAFTA talks began.

Our government strongly supports supply management and will continue to defend it and all interests of Canadian farm families.

[*English*]

Mr. Alistair MacGregor (Cowichan—Malahat—Langford, NDP): Mr. Speaker, more than 13,000 family farms in Canada work under the supply management system. The Prime Minister said the government would be flexible with our system in NAFTA renegotiations, and now the agriculture minister wants to wait to see what's on the table. What is that supposed to mean?

When are the Liberals going to stop with the non-answers, protect our family farms, and stand up for the supply-managed sectors?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Jean-Claude Poissant (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as we said, we are the party that brought in supply management and we will defend it. It is a model of stability for the world. We are the party that will continue to defend it. We have repeatedly said that our American partners' proposals on supply management are unacceptable.

* * *

[*English*]

CARBON PRICING

Mr. John Barlow (Foothills, CPC): Mr. Speaker, The agriculture minister claims Canadian farmers are fully supportive of the Liberal carbon tax. I do not think they are actually consulting with Canadian farmers at all. In fact, the president of the Western Canadian Wheat Growers said, "Farmers don't agree on everything, but if there's one issue they stand together on, it's in opposition to the carbon tax."

How can the agriculture minister be misrepresenting farmers? Will he end the carbon tax cover-up? Will he tell us how much the Liberals' farm-killing carbon tax will cost our rural families?

Hon. Catherine McKenna (Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, let us start by noting that we are all in this together, that climate change is real, and that no one knows this more than farmers. When I talk to farmers, they are worried about droughts, they are worried about floods, and they are worried about extreme weather.

Once again, it is up to provinces to determine what they are going to do. Provinces can decide that they are going to exempt fuels used by farmers. It is up to them to design a system that makes sense in their province. It is up to them to decide what they are going to do with the revenues.

Mr. Randy Hoback (Prince Albert, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Agriculture's claims that farmers support a carbon tax are ridiculous.

APAS and Grain Growers of Canada are speaking out against it. The Province of Saskatchewan has even taken the Liberals to court over the tax. Saskatchewan farmers are well aware that the cost of the carbon tax will have an impact on their livelihood.

The Liberals refuse to tell us how much it will cost. When will the Liberals come clean on this carbon tax?

Hon. Catherine McKenna (Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as I have said, farmers and ranchers understand that we need to protect our environment, that we need to take action on climate change.

As we have said, it is up to provinces, like Saskatchewan, to determine how they are going to implement pricing, and they can give the revenues right back. They can give revenues back to the farmers. They can decide to cut the provincial sales tax. That is their own decision. That is the right way.

We believe we are all in this together, and I really wish the opposition would not make this a partisan issue. We have kids, we have grandkids, and they are owed a clean future. They also are—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

• (1440)

The Speaker: Order, order. This is a good way to lose a question. Order.

Hon. Alice Wong (Richmond Centre, CPC): Mr. Speaker, one of the largest challenges seniors are facing is being able to afford the basic necessities of life.

We all know that when the Liberals impose a new tax grab, it hikes the cost of living and seniors are disproportionately affected.

Why will the Liberals not finally reveal what their carbon tax will cost seniors?

Hon. Jean-Yves Duclos (Minister of Families, Children and Social Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to talk about the well-being and welfare of our seniors. Unfortunately, I am less happy to talk about the fact that Conservatives voted against every measure we put forward in favour of seniors.

We have brought the age of eligibility for old age security back to 65 years old, which is going to prevent 100,000 seniors from entering severe poverty. Unfortunately, the Harper Conservatives voted against that. We raised the guaranteed income supplement to help 900,000 seniors. Unfortunately, again our Conservative friends voted against that.

Mr. Dan Albas (Central Okanagan—Similkameen—Nicola, CPC): Mr. Speaker, these Liberals attack small businesses time and time again.

They are forcing job creators to pay a carbon tax that will increase input costs, and the Prime Minister refuses to tell them how much it will cost. Small businesses know that the misguided tax will impact the way they do business and how many employees they can hire. Some will be forced to shut down.

Why will the Prime Minister not tell small businesses, the lifeblood of our economy, how much more they will be paying with his national carbon tax?

Hon. Bardish Chagger (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Minister of Small Business and Tourism, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, let us talk about the government's support of small businesses.

This is the government that lowered the small business tax rate to 9% by 2019. What did the Conservatives do? The Conservatives voted against it.

We just brought forward the first-ever women's entrepreneurship strategy, almost $2 billion in support for women entrepreneurs. What did the Conservatives do? Voted against it.

Some hon. members: Voted against it.

Hon. Bardish Chagger: This government will continue supporting small businesses. They are the backbone of the economy. We will not just say, we will support them. What will the Conservatives continue to do? Vote against them.

Some hon. members: Vote against them.

The Speaker: Order. We do not need any chanting. Thank you very much.

* * *

INTERNATIONAL TRADE

Mr. Scott Duvall (Hamilton Mountain, NDP): Mr. Speaker, after the Trump administration imposed devastating 25% tariffs on steel and 10% on aluminum, workers are worried about how they are going to take care of their families. Just the steel industry alone has at least 22,000 direct jobs and supports another 100,000 indirect jobs, especially in Ontario and in my community of Hamilton.

Yesterday the Prime Minister avoided this very simple question, which I will ask again. When will the government announce a support package for steel and aluminum workers, like it did for softwood lumber workers last year?

Hon. Navdeep Bains (Minister of Innovation, Science and Economic Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we will always defend our steel and aluminum workers. We have done so in the past and we will continue to do so, going forward. As the member opposite knows full well, the tariffs that have been imposed by the Americans are completely unacceptable. They are unwarranted. That is why we are working with industry and we are working with workers to determine the best path forward. Again, make no mistake about it: we will always defend our workers in the aluminum and steel sectors.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Karine Trudel (Jonquière, NDP): Mr. Speaker, fine speeches here in the House are all well and good, but thousands of workers and SMEs across the country are mired in uncertainty due to these unacceptable tariffs on steel and aluminum.

Given the risks and the difficult months ahead, the government needs to act quickly. These workers and businesses deserve meaningful action, not just words. They need support right now.

Will the government follow Quebec's lead and quickly announce a plan to protect our jobs, our SMEs, and most of all, our workers?

Hon. Navdeep Bains (Minister of Innovation, Science and Economic Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the tariffs imposed by the United States are unacceptable. That is why we are going to continue to defend our workers and our steel and aluminum industry.

I have met with the producers association. All options are on the table.

● (1445)

Mr. Shaun Chen (Scarborough North, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am sure everyone here in the House would agree that there has never been a better time to diversify our markets.

Last year, new trade agreements with the European Union and Ukraine came into effect, reducing tariffs and giving Canadian exporters access to a new combined market of over half a billion consumers.

[*English*]

CPTPP will do exactly the same. Can the minister please update this House on Canada's efforts to bring this important agreement into force?

Hon. François-Philippe Champagne (Minister of International Trade, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the member for Scarborough North for his excellent work. Canadians understand there has never been a better time to diversify. That is why with CPTPP we will improve market access and we will improve new industries for Canadians. That means that workers, small and medium-sized businesses, and their families and their communities will have a better chance to succeed. We will continue to work for Canadians. Canadians know one thing: they know they can trust us when it comes to international trade.

* * *

CARBON PRICING

Mrs. Cheryl Gallant (Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Toronto Liberals have been charging a hidden carbon tax since 2009. It has doubled the price of electricity in Ontario. It has cost tens of thousands of jobs as companies move to the United States. It has forced seniors on fixed incomes to choose whether to eat or heat. Now, the Ottawa Liberals want to charge another carbon tax. When will they stop the cover-up and tell Canadians how much that carbon tax is going to cost?

Hon. Jean-Yves Duclos (Minister of Families, Children and Social Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, indeed I did not have enough time in my earlier response to detail other measures that we put in, in favour of seniors, and unfortunately the Harper Conservatives voted against them. We enhanced the Canada pension plan six months after we came into office to increase the generosity, the flexibility, and the care with which our seniors will be able to retire when they do retire. Unfortunately, our Conservative friends voted against that.

We also launched the first-ever historic national housing strategy, which will have a direct impact on seniors—

The Speaker: Order.

The hon. member for Durham.

Hon. Erin O'Toole (Durham, CPC): Mr. Speaker, in Ontario, the auto industry competes with the U.S. for investment. In Michigan, there is no carbon tax, but in Ontario the Liberals are imposing a carbon tax scheme that is putting our auto sector at a disadvantage. Now the auto sector also faces the risks of tariffs. Will the Liberals reveal the cost of the carbon tax on the auto industry, and will they agree to exempt the auto industry from their carbon tax so we can keep these jobs in Canada?

Hon. Navdeep Bains (Minister of Innovation, Science and Economic Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we have a thriving and vibrant automotive sector in Ontario and across the country. Do members know why? It is because it has a government that backs it up and supports it all the way. Since 2015, we have been working very closely with the automotive sector, building partnerships. What that has resulted in is a $5.6-billion total investment in the automotive sector. This has helped create and preserve thousands of jobs. This is what we are focused on. We are focused on growth and jobs and we will continue to support the automotive sector and build the car of the future as well.

Hon. Ed Fast (Abbotsford, CPC): Mr. Speaker, enough of the carbon tax cover-up. Canadians are fed up with the Prime Minister's refusal to tell them how much this harmful carbon tax will cost them. In B.C., drivers are now paying a whopping $1.60 a litre to tank up their cars. The Liberal carbon tax is going to add 11¢ to that. The price of everything, from groceries to home heating, is going to go up under the Liberal government.

When will the Prime Minister finally tell us how much his carbon tax will cost the average Canadian family, and what is he hiding?

Hon. Catherine McKenna (Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, where are the Conservatives hiding their climate plan? That is all we all want to know. Where is the climate plan?

When it comes to putting a price on pollution, we have an April 30 document and I am very happy to share that personally with the member opposite. We often have conversations and I am happy to deliver it. I will hand it over to him, because that is where it explains that pricing pollution is like taking 25 million cars off the roads. It is up to provinces what they do with the revenues. They can do tax cuts. They can give it back through rebates. They can—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

● (1450)

The Speaker: Order. I would ask the hon. member for Edmonton Manning and others not to interrupt when someone else has the floor.

The hon. member for Abbotsford.

Hon. Ed Fast (Abbotsford, CPC): Again, Mr. Speaker, there is no answer.

The news gets worse. The Liberal government has admitted that it will not meet its climate change targets. We all know the Prime Minister is secretly planning to increase the carbon tax from $50 to $100, to $200, even to $300 per tonne in the coming years, so what is he hiding? Can anyone imagine how astronomically expensive life would become in such a world?

One more time to the Prime Minister, how much will this carbon tax cost the—

The Speaker: The hon. Minister of Environment.

Hon. Catherine McKenna (Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is really sad that we have fake news coming from the other side, misinformation and fake news. The only thing that is being hidden is what the Conservatives' climate plan is. Maybe the next time they get up, they can tell us what their climate plan is, how they are going to tackle climate change, and how they are going to create jobs, which they were not able to do either.

The Speaker: Order. The hon. member for Dufferin—Caledon will come to order, along with others.

The hon. member for Drummond.

* * *

[*Translation*]

INTERNATIONAL TRADE

Mr. François Choquette (Drummond, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the new comprehensive and progressive agreement for trans-Pacific partnership, or CPTPP, will have a devastating impact on Canadian workers.

At a time when we need economic leadership, the Liberals introduced a trade agreement that will cost us some 58,000 jobs. The Liberals signed an agreement that does not even include the words "climate change". I would hardly call that a progressive agreement.

Why does this government support an agreement that will have devastating effects on the economy and the environment?

Hon. François-Philippe Champagne (Minister of International Trade, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for his question.

We will always be there to listen to stakeholders. Canadians understand that there has never been a better time to diversify our markets. That is why we signed the CPTPP and introduced a bill to ratify it this morning.

This agreement will open new markets and provide new opportunities for our small and medium-sized businesses across the country. It will benefit families and workers in the ridings of every member of the House of Commons.

Canadians know they can count on us when it comes to international trade.

[*English*]

Ms. Tracey Ramsey (Essex, NDP): Mr. Speaker, now Canadians know the government is choosing the economy over the environment.

The legislation for the trans-Pacific partnership was tabled today, despite overwhelming evidence that this deal will be devastating to auto workers and supply management. NAFTA is in shambles and Trump has launched an attack on our auto sector, with threats of outrageous and illegal tariffs. What are the Liberals doing to help auto workers? Today they are tabling a deal that is a betrayal to auto workers, their families, and the communities that depend on them.

Why does the government insist on ratifying this terrible trade deal that will cost our economy close to 58,000 jobs?

Hon. François-Philippe Champagne (Minister of International Trade, Lib.): It seems that it is only the NDP, Mr. Speaker, that does not understand that there has never been a better time to diversify. Canadians across our nation understand, but it is only the NDP that does not understand that there is no better time to diversify. That is why we signed the CPTPP. That is why we introduced the law this morning, because we want to create new markets and new opportunities for workers across our nation. Canadians who are watching know they can trust us when it comes to international trade.

* * *

[*Translation*]

IMMIGRATION, REFUGEES, AND CITIZENSHIP

Mr. Pierre Paul-Hus (Charlesbourg—Haute-Saint-Charles, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I have asked at least 60 questions about the border crisis and whether there is a plan to address it. I am still waiting for an answer.

A Department of Homeland Security report confirms that the U.S. is concerned about the back and forth of illegal migrants across the border. Quebeckers and Canadians feel abandoned by the Liberals, who are not taking their concerns over safety seriously and who do not seem to want to negotiate with the Americans. It is the government's responsibility to ensure the integrity of our border.

Where is the plan?

● (1455)

Hon. Marc Garneau (Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, our government remains determined to ensure the safety of Canadians and to secure our borders. Canadians can count on it.

The Conservatives' proposals would militarize the border in violation of international law. Those are not serious solutions. We will continue to ensure that Canadian law is enforced and that our international obligations are met.

Mr. Pierre Paul-Hus (Charlesbourg—Haute-Saint-Charles, CPC): Mr. Speaker, as you can see, after 60 times, they are still talking nonsense.

We never talked about militarizing the border. Give me a break. Even the minister said the other day that he was pleased that the opposition leader went to Saint-Bernard-de-Lacolle to see the situation for himself, when the Minister of Immigration has never been.

Canadians are pretty clear on what is going on, and now, the government has lost their trust.

We do not want bogus answers and we do not want to create problems. We want to know if there is a plan.

[*English*]

Hon. Ralph Goodale (Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in the report from the U.S. this past week, the comments by and large were very favourable about the relationship with Canada, about what they called the "northern border", and about the strength of security and other operations along that border. Indeed, the former secretary of homeland security, who is now chief of staff in the White House had nothing but praise for the Canadian border and said that he was happy to work with Canada to ensure that the border was constantly thinning, to the advantage of both countries.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Steven Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis, CPC): Mr. Speaker, let us be clear: the Liberals are slashing border funding.

Since 2015, they have cut $302 million, particularly with respect to criminal investigations. Since the Prime Minister's Twitter blunder, our border services officers have been reduced to tour guides, and Roxham Road is a sieve.

My question is not about transportation or public safety; it is for the Minister of Immigration. What is his plan to finally stop this wave of illegal immigration?

[*English*]

Hon. Ralph Goodale (Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman speaks of budget reductions with respect to CBSA. If he in fact follows the governmental decisions with respect to those fiscal measures he will find that they were implemented in 2014. He was the minister at the time.

* * *

TELECOMMUNICATIONS

Ms. Jean Yip (Scarborough—Agincourt, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, with the growth in the digital economy in Canada, access to reliable telecommunications services at an affordable price is essential for Canadians. However, Canadians currently pay some of the highest prices for wireless and Internet services in comparison to other developed countries, making them inaccessible for some. This is something I hear repeatedly from many of my constituents.

Could the minister please share with us what the government plans to do to ensure Canadians have access to reliable, affordable, and quality wireless and Internet services?

Hon. Navdeep Bains (Minister of Innovation, Science and Economic Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the member for Scarborough—Agincourt for her advocacy on this issue. She has been a true champion.

We believe Canadians deserve quality, low-priced telecommunications services. That is why we have asked industry to step up in a big way. Through the connecting families program, low-cost Internet will be provided to hundreds of thousands of Canadian families right across Canada. Our government will always fight for lower prices and better prices for consumers.

* * *

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Hon. Peter Kent (Thornhill, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Liberals' moral equivalence with Israel and its enemies is notorious, and when they had an opportunity to stand against a one-sided motion against Israel at the United Nations yesterday, and in direct contradiction to votes in the House this week, they did it again. The Liberals directed Canada's diplomats to sit on their hands, to abstain from standing with the only democracy in the Middle East.

The Liberals always show up for the annual Walk With Israel, as fair-weather friends would. Why did the Liberals refuse to stand with Israel yesterday?

Mr. Matt DeCourcey (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Conservatives continue to make Canada's long-standing steadfast support for Israel a partisan issue despite being told not to do so. Canada has long been a friend of Israel and we believe that resolutions at the UN should accurately reflect the situation on the ground. That is why Canada supported a U.S. amendment to yesterday's resolution that would have explicitly referred to the role of Hamas in the situation in Gaza. Hamas is a terrorist organization, and Canada calls on the international community to stand up to Hamas. Hamas must end its incitement of violence against Israel.

* * *

● (1500)

MARIJUANA

Mr. Don Davies (Vancouver Kingsway, NDP): Mr. Speaker, as we stand on the cusp of cannabis legalization, we face the deep irony that Canadians continue to be arrested at alarming rates for behaviour that will soon be legal. It was inexcusable for the Liberal government to exclude pardons from the cannabis act, and now the Senate, the so-called chamber of sober second thought, has also neglected to address this glaring omission. It is enough to question its sobriety.

When will the hundreds of thousands of Canadians who carry unjust records for simple possession finally receive amnesty?

The Speaker: I urge the hon. member for Vancouver Kingsway to be cautious with his language about the other place.

The hon. Minister of Public Safety.

Hon. Ralph Goodale (Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Parliament is in the process of dealing with two very important pieces of legislation, Bill C-45 and Bill C-46. They are, together, making some of the most profound changes ever with respect to the legal handling of cannabis in the history of Canada. When that process is completed, the law will change, and at that time, the government will consider all appropriate measures to ensure fairness in our system.

[*Translation*]

HOUSING

Mr. Pierre Breton (Shefford, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the government has announced its vision for the new homelessness partnering strategy. This announcement is the culmination of more than a year of work, including the release of the first ever national housing strategy and its commitment to provide $2 billion to combat homelessness.

Can the Minister of Families, Children and Social Development explain to the House how this new strategy will prevent homelessness?

Hon. Jean-Yves Duclos (Minister of Families, Children and Social Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to begin by thanking the member for Shefford for his support in the fight against homelessness. I would also like to take this opportunity to thank the members of the advisory committee on homelessness for their hard work and excellent report.

Yesterday in Montreal, I had the opportunity to launch "reaching home", a program that will double investment in the fight against homelessness and reduce homelessness in Canada by at least 50% over the next few years. Through this partnership and these investments, we are demonstrating the return of federal leadership in ensuring that everyone has a safe and affordable place to call home

* * *

[*English*]

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Mr. Garnett Genuis (Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan, CPC): Mr. Speaker, let us be eminently clear to the parliamentary secretary. When the Liberals refuse to stand with our allies we will challenge them to do better. That is our job. That is what we were sent here to do. One wonders why they are so bent on getting on the UN Security Council just to abstain once they get there.

The parliamentary secretary and the Prime Minister voted to immediately designate the Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps as a listed terrorist entity under the Criminal Code. That is how they voted, so when will the Liberals follow the will of the House and immediately designate the IRGC as a terrorist organization?

Hon. Ralph Goodale (Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in fact, the IRGC's Quds Force is already listed as a terrorist entity. That is the branch of the force that, in fact, involves itself in terrorist operations. In addition, Iran is a state sponsor of terror, all listed under the State Immunity Act, and the senior officials of that regime are already subject to special economic measures under the SEMA legislation. The process for listing actually involves an investigation by the RCMP and CSIS and that process will go forward.

[*Translation*]

MARIJUANA

Mr. Rhéal Fortin (Rivière-du-Nord, QD): Mr. Speaker, with respect to allowing home cultivation of cannabis, yesterday, the Prime Minister tried to justify his power trip by claiming that the move was meant to fight organized crime. He is ignoring what the provinces, the Senate, the opposition, cities and police forces are telling him.

Is that his plan to fight organized crime? To allow people to grow three or four pot plants at home?

Could this government be serious for once and let those who tackle the real problems, on the ground, make the decisions that are theirs to make?

● (1505)

Hon. Ginette Petitpas Taylor (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, protecting the health and safety of Canadians is our number one priority.

Finally, we are moving forward to ensure that we have a system that actually works. Finally, we have also created a legal source for those who will not have access to it through provincial or territorial stores or a digital platform. We are also following the advice of the task force as well as the approach taken by several U.S. states that have legalized and regulated cannabis use.

Mr. Rhéal Fortin (Rivière-du-Nord, QD): Mr. Speaker, I think we have the wrong record.

Legalizing cannabis is one thing, but making a pot plant as common as a tomato plant is another. The Quebec government has chosen to prohibit growing pot in gardens: it does not believe that this helps prevent young people from accessing marijuana. That is its legitimate choice, and it is consistent with this government's goal of preventing young people from accessing cannabis.

Why, then, is it disrespecting Quebec's choices within its jurisdiction?

Hon. Ginette Petitpas Taylor (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, once again, protecting the health and safety of Canadians is a top priority for our government, and home growing will help displace the underground market in Canada. It will also create a legal source for those who will not have access to intermediate sources, such as provincial or territorial stores or online platforms. We are also following the advice of the task force and various experts, and our approach is consistent with that adopted by other states. We are satisfied that this is the right approach.

* * *

[*English*]

NATURAL RESOURCES

Ms. Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP): Mr. Speaker, earlier today, a major report on the safety failures of the pipeline safety system in this country was released by Équiterre. It is a very disturbing record, and it is getting worse.

[*Translation*]

Fifty-five percent of the oil pipeline incidents in Quebec since 2008 occurred in 2017, most of them involving the Trans-Northern pipeline.

[*English*]

Will the government launch an independent investigation into this unacceptable record of shoddy monitoring and weak enforcement?

Ms. Kim Rudd (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Natural Resources, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, getting resources to market must be done with the highest regard for safety and the protection of the environment. The Pipeline Safety Act strengthens Canada's pipeline safety system, enshrining the polluter pays principle in federal law. Companies are liable, regardless of fault.

Our budget 2017 includes $17.4 million for the NEB to enhance its pipeline safety oversight activities, along with a further $1.9 million to provide Canadians with timely access to information on energy regulations and pipeline safety.

Hon. Ed Fast: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I believe there have been discussions, and if you seek it, you will find consent for the following motion.

I move that, notwithstanding any Standing Order or usual practices of the House, Bill C-79, An Act to implement the Comprehensive and Progressive Agreement for Trans-Pacific Partnership between Canada, Australia, Brunei, Chile, Japan, Malaysia, Mexico, New Zealand, Peru, Singapore and Vietnam, be deemed to have been read a second time and referred to a committee of the whole, deemed considered in committee of the whole, deemed reported without amendments, deemed concurred in at report stage, and deemed read a third time and passed.

The Speaker: Does the hon. member have the unanimous consent of the House to move the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Pierre Paul-Hus: Mr. Speaker, I believe you will find unanimous consent for me to table the report from the Department of Homeland Security confirming what I put forward in my question.

The Speaker: Does the hon. member have the unanimous consent of the House?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Speaker: The hon. member for Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis on a point of order.

Hon. Steven Blaney: Mr. Speaker, during question period, the Minister of Public Safety referred to the budget of the Canadian Border Services Agency, which was $2,001,144,000 in 2014-15 when I had the privilege of being a Conservative minister. That budget then dropped to $1,698,951,000 two years later under the Liberal government, a drop—

● (1510)

The Speaker: Order. That is a matter for debate.

Hon. Steven Blaney: I ask for the unanimous consent of the House to table the Library of Parliament document that provers that—

The Speaker: Order. Does the hon. member have the unanimous consent of the House to table this document?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Speaker: The hon. Minister of the Environment on a point of order.

[*English*]

Hon. Catherine McKenna: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to table, in both official languages, a document produced by Government of Canada officials, entitled "Estimated impacts of the Federal Carbon Pollution Pricing System", which was published on April 30. This document includes an overview of the federal system, the estimated emissions reductions across Canada, and the economic impacts of pricing pollution, including impacts on GDP, implications for households, and the benefits of pricing pollution.

The Speaker: Order. The hon. member for Calgary—Nose Hill is rising on a point of order.

Hon. Michelle Rempel: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Could the minister tell us on what page in that document is the cost of the carbon tax for Canadians?

The Speaker: It sounds like debate and not a point of order. Ministers are able, under the rules, to table documents and describe them.

The hon. member for Abbotsford is rising on another point of order.

Hon. Ed Fast: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. As you know, all of us do our best to be truth-tellers in this House. Today in this House was a great disappointment for many of us, certainly on this side of the House, who believe in the truth. It was the Minister of Environment who today suggested that British Columbia has a revenue-neutral carbon tax. That is false. Under the—

The Speaker: Again, I am afraid we are into debate here.

The hon. member for Flamborough—Glanbrook is rising on what I suspect is a point of order.

* * *

POINTS OF ORDER

ORAL QUESTIONS

Mr. David Sweet (Flamborough—Glanbrook, CPC): Mr. Speaker, with the greatest of respect, I was wondering if I could ask you to review the tapes.

Earlier, the member for Vancouver Kingsway made a comment that was general to the Liberal bench, and you called him out for that. Just previous to that, the member for Fredericton made a very egregious remark, not through you, Mr. Speaker, but directly to the

Tribute

member for Thornhill. I feel if one is worthy of being called out, the other one should be as well.

With all due respect, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if you could review the video and peruse your decision there.

The Speaker: I thank the hon. member for raising this point. I will review the video.

* * *

[*Translation*]

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Hon. Candice Bergen (Portage—Lisgar, CPC): Mr. Speaker, with the end of the parliamentary session approaching, can the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons tell us what business the government has for the rest of this week and next week?

Hon. Bardish Chagger (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Minister of Small Business and Tourism, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this afternoon, we will finish debating the last opposition day motion in this supply cycle. Then, we will debate the main estimates.

Tomorrow morning, we will begin third reading of Bill C-68 on fisheries.

Next week will be a a busy one. Priority will be given to the following bills: Bill C-45 on cannabis, Bill C-59 on national security, Bill C-64 on abandoned vessels, Bill C-69 on environmental assessments, and Bill C-71 on firearms.

* * *

HON. MEMBER FOR OUTREMONT

Mr. Guy Caron (Rimouski-Neigette—Témiscouata—Les Basques, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I rise in the House to recognize the hard work of the member for Outremont, who will soon be leaving the House.

I met the member for Outremont for the first time in September 2007 during the Outremont byelection. Of course, I knew him by reputation since he had been the representative for Chomedey in the Quebec National Assembly and then the Quebec environment minister.

At that time, I was told that his personality reflected his Irish ancestry, and that is true. I was told that he had an innate sense of politics that he had inherited from his great-great grandfather, Honoré Mercier, the ninth premier of Quebec, and that is true too. I was also told that, like his mentor Claude Ryan, he could assimilate and synthesize the news and quickly determine what the political implications would be, and that is also true.

● (1515)

[*English*]

What I did find, canvassing with the member for Outremont in the streets of Outremont in 2007, was a man who had, and still has, the rare ability to connect with people in the street or at home and to make them feel totally that he understands them and that he will fight for them. Fight he did, first in winning a riding that pundits never tired of calling an unassailable Liberal fortress, then in confirming that win in the 2008 general election, proving that the by-election was not a fluke.

[*Translation*]

He spent the next three years advising Jack Layton in the context of a fragile minority government in which the NDP held the balance of power. During that time, he sowed the seeds that blossomed into the great orange wave of 2011.

Then came the tragic death of Jack Layton, and that changed everything.

[*English*]

The member for Outremont defied the odds to succeed him at the helm of the official opposition, providing the guidance, the stability, and the discipline we needed as the then government in waiting.

Many pundits dismissed us as a bunch of newcomers who were held together by Jack and said we would crumble after his passing, but under the leadership of the member for Outremont, we were often referred to as one of the most effective official oppositions. His prosecution day after day after day of the Stephen Harper government has been a hallmark in parliamentary history.

[*Translation*]

The 2015 general election results were a disappointment, and I know nobody was more disappointed than him. I also know he gave his all to the campaign and that, true to his Irish roots, his devotion to the NDP drove him to keep up the fight.

It was the end of an era that began in a restaurant in Hudson, where Jack and Olivia met with him and his wife, Catherine, and where, against all odds, Jack convinced him to join a party that did not have a single seat in Quebec at the time.

I would like to thank his wife, Catherine, his children, Matthew and Gregory, his daughters-in-law, Jasmyne and Catherine, and his grandchildren, Juliette, Raphaël, and Leonard, for being so patient and for sharing him with us.

I would also like to thank Chantale, Graham, Mathilde, and Miriam for their dedication and for playing such an important role in this saga.

All I can say to the member for Outremont is thank you and see you soon.

[*English*]

Hon. Marc Garneau (Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, today it is my privilege and, indeed, my pleasure to stand before the House and thank the member for Outremont for his profound dedication and service to our country.

I will say that this individual has made a remarkable impact on the lives of Canadians, particularly in Quebec, and has challenged governments to strive to ensure that every Canadian has an opportunity to succeed. There is no doubt that we are all the stronger for it.

While he has seen governments change, he has continued to represent the strong beliefs and values of his party, and as we all know, they were well heard. I feel like it might even be a little quieter here after his departure.

During his tenure as the leader of the opposition, his unique style won him praise, as well as the ire of the former government. He was not afraid of holding their feet to the fire to get the answers Canadians demanded, and he also gave us a run for our money.

[*Translation*]

Although we do not always share the same values and beliefs, I must say that I respect them and hold them in high regard. I also respect his great integrity and, most of all, his unwavering dedication to Canadians.

My hon. colleague is to be admired for his many professional achievements and for being true to his principles throughout his very long political career. This member has honourably served the people of Canada, and on behalf of the Government of Canada, I wish to thank him for that.

His future students at the University of Montreal will be very lucky to have him as a professor. It will no doubt be very stimulating.

● (1520)

[*English*]

All jokes aside, it has been a great honour to serve this country with him. He has challenged me personally, as well as this government and former governments, to strive to ensure that Canadians live in a country that they can be proud to call home.

On behalf of the Liberal government and all Canadians, we thank him for his dedication. I know that he will move into his next role and help shape a generation of students to follow in his footsteps of asking tough questions, challenging beliefs, and making a difference.

Before I conclude, I would also like to thank his family for sharing him with Canadians for this very long period of time.

Hon. Lisa Raitt (Milton, CPC): Mr. Speaker, today I am so pleased to rise on behalf of the Conservative caucus to bid farewell to a colleague who has served the Canadian people in the House for over a decade, the hon. member for Outremont.

[*Translation*]

It is a privilege and an honour, but also an immense responsibility, to be elected here to the House. He has served his constituents and supporters across the country with dignity and respect, and we thank him for that.

[*English*]

While he has served here in the House of Commons, he has also served as Quebec's minister of sustainable development, environment and parks. On the federal level, he has served as the NDP House leader, Quebec lieutenant, and, finally, leader of the official opposition in the House of Commons.

However, his most lasting contribution, the moment at which he truly changed this Parliament for future generations, is when he had the courage to stand for what he believed in, speak truth to power, do politics differently, and refuse to shave, ever.

Dare I say that not since Abraham Lincoln have such wonderful whiskers become so entwined with a political personality. Legend has it that the moment he became the leader of Canada's New Democrats, Gillette's stock took a tumble.

Look how far we have come. We can see his legacy even in the room today, with the member for Rosemont—La Petite-Patrie and the member for Honoré-Mercier, and I wish I had a nickel for every time I have caught the member for Chilliwack—Hope looking longingly at the full growth on the member's face.

Of course, the member is much more than a political trendsetter. While the member proved how skilled he was in the House of Commons, mainly at the expense of my former government, that is not my lasting memory. I will always remember the member for two things: his humour and his humanity. I say humour, because who else would dress up as an Angry Bird on Halloween? His appearances at the press gallery dinner were the best. As well, we knew he had that quick smile and the Irish twinkle.

I do remember one time when I wish I had been able to warn the member about something. He once appeared in a ball pit with presenter Mark Critch on *This Hour Has 22 Minutes*. Having cleaned ball pits for 17 years, I should have told him before then never to go into a ball pit. Parents in the House of Commons understand what I am talking about.

On the humanity side, in the 10 years I have been in the House with the member, we have shared grief, losing both Jack Layton and our dear friend Jim Flaherty.

I can also say that my first encounter with the member showed humanity as well. There was a story in the *National Post* about our humble beginnings. Indeed, the member started his first job at 14, working nine-hour days in a textile factory in Montreal. He approached me after the story appeared, because it had noted that I, as well, started at 14, working in a Dairy Queen for very long hours.

It made me have an instant connection with the member, and it reminds me that even though we had differences of opinion, and even though he called for my resignation many times, we do share many common bonds.

● (1525)

[*Translation*]

Throughout his career, he has had the support of his loving wife, Catherine, and of his sons, Matt and Greg.

[*English*]

Catherine has always been incredibly warm and kind to me. When we meet, either in airports or at events, we always share some words, which are always nicer than the words I share with her husband. For her kindness and generosity, and making new friends across the aisle, I will always be grateful. It is an absolute honour and pleasure to have made her acquaintance.

Catherine and his family will stay by his side as he leaves politics and joins the academic world. It is an exciting new chapter, and I am sure his future students will appreciate his humour, his humanity, and the wealth of knowledge and experience he will bring to the classroom.

On behalf of my Conservative colleagues, I wish the hon. member every success in his new career and the best of luck to him and his family.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Rhéal Fortin (Rivière-du-Nord, QD): Mr. Speaker, I have known the member for Outremont for many years. It has been quite a while since we were putting docks in the water, my goodness, but I have always appreciated this passionate and brilliant man. I am also grateful to him. Along with Gilles Duceppe, he was undoubtedly the politician who was the most help securing my victory in 2015, though perhaps somewhat unwittingly. I do not think that this was part of his plan.

Now that the Prime Minister has decided to buy a pipeline, the member for Outremont could surely tell him that a pipeline is expensive. It cost him the prime ministership.

The member for Outremont is politics' most faithful embodiment of the people of Quebec. Sometimes Liberal, sometimes Conservative, sometimes NDP, he is a Quebecker. I honestly believe that, with his departure today, Quebeckers are losing one of their greatest and most effective defenders in the House. Obviously, I mean from a federalist party.

Elected as an NDP member in 2007, he preceded the orange wave that swept through Quebec in 2011, a great win by his friend Jack Layton. He set himself apart as soon as he was elected. He appeared in every forum speaking intelligently on all kinds of topics, cracking jokes at the right times, expressing outrage for the right reasons, making insightful comments, and coming up with the killer line that would take out his opponent. He was the goon, the NDP's own Claude Lemieux. None of the other teams can stand him, but everyone wants to have him on theirs.

I honestly and sincerely believe that the NDP is losing its best and most formidable debater today. He would have made his illustrious and legendary forefather Honoré Mercier proud. Formidable, incisive and hard-hitting, frankly, the man we salute today has been a stand-up Quebecker throughout his career, and we thank him for his contribution.

Ms. Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP): Mr. Speaker, I also have the honour to rise today and join all my fellow MPs in paying tribute to our colleague, the distinguished member for Outremont.

Tribute

[*English*]

It is hard, as members would recognize, to play a sort of backup hitter at the very last of many fine speeches. However, I want to acknowledge something that was not specifically mentioned.

The word "courage" was used. I would not attribute it to continuing to wear a beard, but it does have to with the face. I think it was the bravest thing I ever saw. We were all together in the leader's debate in Montreal. It was a tough thing to say that telling women what they can and cannot wear is not the proper role of federal leadership, and I want to thank the hon. member again for taking a strong stand on the very divisive niqab debate.

● (1530)

[*Translation*]

It can be said of every member that their family is always there, working side by side with them. If I am not mistaken, the member for Outremont was first elected in 1994 to the Quebec National Assembly, and already that was a tough job. It is an enormous sacrifice for a family. If there is one thing that appeared to me quite clearly, it is the very strong bond between the member and his extraordinary wife, Catherine.

[*English*]

Like the hon. member for Milton, I want to say how much I have enjoyed getting to know Catherine P. Mulcair, someone who has shown extraordinary presence in all situations at his side. It must be very handy for anyone leading a political party to be married to a psychologist, which I failed to do.

I also want to say that the relationship informed a lot of of who the member is today. The most moving speech I ever heard my friend, the member for Outremont, give was on the occasion of remembrance of the Shoah. It was a very emotional recollection of going back to the very barn in the fields of France where his wife's mother hid throughout the Holocaust, descendants of Sephardic Jews hiding in a barn from the Nazi regime of Vichy, France. I do not think I have ever heard any words on the occasion of remembrance of the Shoah that were more keenly felt and brought us back to the individual cases and enormous horrors and evil of that period.

With that, I join others here in thanking Catherine, Matt, Greg, the family as a whole, who have toiled alongside, in a very distinguished career, the hon. member for Outremont.

[*Translation*]

I thank them and wish them all the best in the future.

The Speaker: Before recognizing the hon. member for Outremont, I would like to add my comments to what the other members have said today. He is a well respected member, a distinguished member of the House of Commons. He is comfortable in the House and very effective, as the hon. member for Milton and other members said. He is also a gentleman outside the House, and I always found him to be very cordial. I extend my best wishes for the future to him and his family. I know that his students will be very lucky to have him.

The hon. member for Outremont.

Hon. Thomas Mulcair (Outremont, NDP): Mr. Speaker, thank you and I thank my colleagues for giving me the opportunity to address you one last time before leaving this place for good this summer. What an honour it has been to serve here, the cradle of our democracy, and to represent the people of Outremont who honoured me by electing me four times.

Those who know me will not be surprised to hear me say that my first words are for my wife Catherine, who is here today with our son Matthew, his wife Jasmyne, and our grandchildren Juliette and Raphaël. Our son Greg and his wife Catherine are with their new baby, Leonard, the new light in our lives.

Catherine and I made a pact when we decided together that I would accept the invitation to go into politics. We promised that our relationship and our family would always come first, and we kept that promise.

Catherine advised and helped me and was by my side throughout my career in public service. Her strong values of generosity, respect for others, and kindness in the face of adversity have always inspired and guided me, even though I did not always manage to live by those values as well as she does.

Catherine has her own very demanding career as a psychologist in palliative and long-term care. She also works as a clinician in the private sector. Like many spouses of politicians, she did my work in addition to her own.

I want to share a real example of a long weekend we spent together. On the Friday, we left Montreal, picked up staff in Ottawa, went to the Festival du Voyageur in Winnipeg, went on to Chinese New Year in Vancouver, switched out staff because they were tired, visited Yellowknife, gave a speech to the Calgary Chamber of Commerce, then I returned to Ottawa and Catherine returned to Montreal, and it was just Monday.

The Prime Minister and the leader of the official opposition are familiar with this kind of schedule, but there are not many people, aside from our loved ones, who understand the sacrifices our noble profession demands.

Still, what memories. Our granddaughter Juliette hand-made buttons for my leadership race, our three-year-old grandson Raphaël discovered that Stornoway was a great place for building forts, Greg built and maintained the best leadership campaign website, and Matt and Jasmyne would regularly summarize the news for me because I did not have enough time to read it all.

I owe so much to my family, including my sisters and brothers, Colleen, Peter, Jeannie, Daniel, Deborah, Sheylagh, Maureen, Kelly, and Sean, not to mention my unconditional supporter, my mother, Jeanne Honorine.

● (1535)

[*English*]

We are truly blessed to live in Canada, and we in this place are truly fortunate to be given the chance to try to make it an even better place for all. I have been so lucky to live so many unforgettable experiences in this role.

I remember being on board former AFN national chief Shawn Atleo's boat near his home in Ahousaht when we spotted a pod of whales. Catherine and I were overwhelmed as we saw Shawn go to the side and begin to intone a beautiful song. We quietly asked what he was doing, and he said he was calling the whales with a song of his people. We watched in silent awe as the whale swam right to him. We do have a lot to learn from those who were here first, in particular our obligation to leave things better for generations to come.

My career in government began exactly 40 years ago. It was in Quebec City in the legislation branch of the justice department. It was there that I first learned the inspiring lesson my political mentor Claude Ryan would drive home time and again. Politics is an amazing way to help make people's lives better, and we should never allow anything to supercede that priority.

Here in this place there are so many wonderful people who dedicate themselves to making our lives easier. I want to thank all of the staff. The superb professionals at the table, the delightful pages, the brilliant library personnel, the support staff, and our incredible interpreters who somehow make sense of it all even when we are talking a mile a minute.

I have a special word of thanks for two people.

● (1540)

[*Translation*]

I want to thank Marguerite, from our restaurant, who always managed to find us a place, even whether there were none left, and she did it with a smile.

[*English*]

Sameam Son of our Parliamentary Protective Service, who courageously stood between a deranged man's bullet and us, represented the best of the best of a service that deserves all of our respect.

Politics is a contact sport, but our incredible colleagues and employees are always there to support and to advise, and to soften the blows. I had the good fortune to serve under two extraordinary leaders prior to the arrival of our new chief, the exceptional Jagmeet Singh.

Jack Layton was in a class apart. He contacted me in early 2006, a full year before I was to become his Quebec lieutenant. I had just left cabinet on a question of principle, having refused to sign an order in council transferring land in Mont-Orford Provincial Park to private developers. Jack was amazing, *sans pareil*, when it came to connecting with people and he proposed a supper with his wife, the extraordinary Olivia Chow, and Catherine and me at a restaurant in his old hometown of Hudson, Quebec.

As a Quebecker, he knew the progressive side of politics there. He also knew how tough it was for the NDP, but he was so sure that working together we could break through in our home province. Catherine was convinced, so was I, and an unlikely, hopeful, slightly mad political adventure began.

Tribute

[*Translation*]

Many will recall the orange wave of May 2011, but fewer people will remember that it was preceded by five years of organized and relentless hard work from Lac-Saint-Jean to Trois-Rivières, from Rimouski to Gatineau, and from Sept-Îles to Montreal. Recruiting party supporters was not easy, but together, Layton and Mulcair, as we were often called, worked as a team that did not so much recruit candidates as it hunted them down. We were good. We recruited people like the extraordinary Nycole Turmel, who so brilliantly replaced Jack at a moment's notice upon his departure.

Jack knew that a breakthrough in Quebec was key to the NDP being considered a national party worthy of the name, and Jack would be so proud to know that we currently have such a strong and experienced team of 16 NDP members from Quebec here in the House. It is true that our goal of forming a progressive NDP government eluded us in 2015, but let us never forget that the 44 seats won by the outstanding members during the previous election was our second-best result in 18 federal elections since the NDP was created in 1961.

[*English*]

As I prepare to leave this place this summer, I look back with pride and try to keep only the happier memories in addition to our miraculous breakthrough in Quebec, such as zip lining with Rick Mercer or tailgate parties with the Rider Nation in Regina.

[*Translation*]

I remember the beers I had with Jack and Rebecca Blaikie on a beautiful patio in Trois-Rivières, with the nicest people ever. I remember a long journey by dogsled in Whitehorse, Yukon, where my great-grandparents Mercier were married.

[*English*]

There was also the annual regatta in St. John's and the evening on George Street that always followed, and knocking on then Supreme Court Chief Justice, and neighbour, Beverley McLachlin's door with my grandchildren on Halloween wearing my Angry Bird costume.

Mark Critch, bless his soul, called me right after the 2015 election, telling me he decided he was going to cheer me up. He brought me into a studio, dressed me up as Canadian music star Drake, and had me dance to *Hotline Bling*. Yes, that really was me lip-synching "You used to call me on my cell phone". How appropriate.

I also had the good fortune to travel abroad with colleagues of all parties and to learn their stories. We have a lot more in common than anything that divides us.

The world around us has changed a great deal since I entered this place. While we can and should celebrate and cherish our democracy, our liberties, our rights, and our institutions, we are all keenly aware that no one can take anything for granted in today's world. Democracy needs champions, and Canada should be one of those champions.

● (1545)

[*Translation*]

Here, within these halls, we have the privilege and the duty to enact positive change. I will continue to try making a positive contribution after I leave this place. I will be teaching sustainable development in the most important research university in Quebec, the University of Montreal.

Since civil society also makes a remarkable contribution to progress, I will once again be very active in charitable organizations. I recently agreed to become the chair of the board of directors of Earth Day. There are so many different ways to contribute to the well-being of Canada, but the goal remains the same: to work together not only for the promise of a better society, but also to make it a reality for all.

* * *

● (1550)

[*English*]

POINTS OF ORDER

DRAFT APPROPRIATION BILL—MAIN ESTIMATES, 2018-19

Mr. Mark Strahl (Chilliwack—Hope, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I would like to address the comments made by the parliamentary secretary to the government House leader prior to question period regarding the point of order of the member for Edmonton West.

The parliamentary secretary made a comparison to the estimates being an order of the House to bring in an appropriation bill and a ways and means motion being an order of the House to bring in a tax bill to make his point that the supply bill was in order. While this comparison on this one point is true, it fails to consider the more stringent requirement applied by our rules to supply bills, which the member for Edmonton West referred to earlier.

On page 883 of *House of Commons Procedure and Practice*, there is a more stringent requirement applied to supply bills. It states, "Supply bills must be based on the estimates or interim supply as concurred in by the House." There is no such language for bills based on ways and means.

This is a very significant difference, Mr. Speaker, and I urge you to consider this as you determine whether this bill is in fact in order.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): I want to thank the hon. member. It is duly noted and we will take it under consideration.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

BUSINESS OF SUPPLY

OPPOSITION MOTION—CARBON PRICING

The House resumed consideration of the motion.

Mr. John Brassard (Barrie—Innisfil, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the hon. member for Outremont. It is often difficult to stand after we hear these types of speeches to say goodbye. My experience with the hon. member has been nothing but professional and courteous. I remember, after being first elected, having a chance to meet him. In fact, everyone who visited me on the Hill would always want to meet the hon. member for Outremont. My wife just texted me and said that she would miss his smile. Certainly, she will miss in question period. I wish him and his family well.

Last week, the people of Ontario sent a warning shot across the Prime Minister's bow. It related to the carbon tax in particular. We are here on this opposition day with our motion to find out how much the carbon tax will cost the average Canadian family.

During question period, the minister tabled some documents from an April 30 report, basically propaganda from the government, talking about emissions and all kinds of things. However, nothing talked to the issue at hand, which is that the government knows how much a carbon tax will cost the average Canadian family and it refuses to tell Canadians and the House. In fact, I would guess that the question on how much the carbon tax will cost Canadians has been asked 200-plus times, and not just in the House but at various committees. The Liberals still refuse to answer that question.

Therefore, we are here today, once again, asking the question, and as the member for Carleton said, we are quite prepared to stay here most of the night to get the answers to the questions for which Canadians are looking.

We also know that just before the last election in Ontario, an Ipsos poll, specifically relating to the carbon tax was done. That poll found that 72% of people in Ontario saw the carbon tax as a tax grab, and 68% thought it would have no meaningful impact on the environment at all. The only poll that matters, quite frankly, was last Thursday when Ontarians sent a strong and clear message, not just to the Kathleen Wynn government but also to the federal government, that they would not to buy into this carbon tax scam.

This is a government that when first elected spoke about transparency and accountability. Oftentimes in the House I have thrown the Liberals' throne speech back at them. I heard the hon. member for Barrie—Springwater—Oro-Medonte throw the throne speech back at them as well. The Liberals talked about transparency and accountability several times in the throne speech. They said that they would be the most open and transparent government in the history of the country, yet their actions have shown nothing to that order. They are not being transparent and accountable on how much a carbon tax will cost the average Canadian family.

Here is what we do know, but they will not tell us this. It will to cost 11¢ a litre for fuel. For the residents of Barrie—Innisfail, who commute up and down the 400, and for all those families involved in sports, taking their kids to hockey and soccer, that means 11¢ more a litre to fill up their tanks. I have four children. My son played AAA hockey. I had other sons who played representative hockey. It costs a lot to travel all over Ontario and have to pay for fuel, and yet the government, through its carbon tax, is proposing 11¢ a litre more.

We also know it will cost $200 a year more to heat our homes, $200 more that people can least afford. Think of the impact that will have on seniors. Think of the impact that will have disproportionately on young families, or single-income families that have to heat their homes, take their kids to dance lessons, hockey, baseball, or soccer. Whatever it is, it will cost them a lot more to pay for the carbon tax.

In a report that recently came out, the PBO talked about $10 billion being taken out of the economy by 2022. However, that number could actually be higher. It could be $35 billion taken out of the economy.

● (1555)

We are talking about competitiveness in our economy, and in an era of being uncompetitive, at least on this side, with increasing taxes and increasing regulatory requirements, when our biggest trading partner in the south is going in the completely opposite direction, how it is going to impact families in a negative way. It is going to impact businesses in a negative way. It will, in fact, have a cascading effect on our economy, because the price of everything is going to go up, not just the price of fuel, as people in B.C. have seen, but also the price of everything that is manufactured, everything that is delivered, and everything people consume, including groceries. There will be an impact because of this carbon tax.

One thing that is not mentioned that often but that is quickly becoming apparent to Canadians is that the government intends to have the GST collected on top of the carbon tax. I know that the Liberals' narrative is that they are going to send all that money back to the provinces, but in fact, the GST that is going to be collected on top of the carbon tax will all be revenue that will come back to the federal government. It is revenue the Liberals will continue to spend on programs that they feel are important to them and not necessarily programs that are important to Canadians.

When we talk about the impact on families with respect to this carbon tax, there will be some who will be insulated from it. Those people sit on the other side. The Prime Minister will feel zero impact from this carbon tax. He has a taxpayer-subsidized home and a taxpayer-subsidized driver. He pays nothing, while middle-class families will be buried, and those who are disproportionately affected, lower-middle-income families, are going to be paying more for this tax. The finance minister, who comes from business and from means, will feel no impact as a result of this carbon tax, because again, he has a taxpayer-funded driver. He will not be paying 11¢ a litre. Of course, the environment minister, who we see often in this House stand up and talk about the calamity that is going to come if there is no carbon tax with respect to the environment, will be just fine as well. The ones who will not be fine are those middle-class families that will have to pay more, and disproportionately, those lower-income families.

It should be no surprise to any of us who live in Ontario that we are on a similar path. We saw last week, as I mentioned earlier, the Kathleen Wynne government, after 15 years, literally get booted out of office, reduced to non-party status. There is a reason for that. We find the current federal Liberal government, this Prime Minister, his cabinet, and his caucus on that same path. It is the same playbook of debt and deficits that was used in Ontario, with the scandals, including cash for access, the gas-plant scandal, which was similar to the pipeline purchase we just saw, and insiders making money from the government green energy program, and the list goes on and on. We are heading down the same path of debt and deficits that people can ill afford.

Again, what we are spending all day doing is asking one simple question on behalf of the Canadians who sent us here: what will the carbon tax cost the average Canadian family? The Liberals refuse to tell us. They have documents that have been blacked out. We know that the information has to be known to the government. The challenge for the Liberals right now is that they are fearful of releasing that information on just how much it is going to cost Canadian families, because they do not want Canadian families to know how much it is going to cost. The political implications for the current Liberal government are similar to the political implications we saw last week in Ontario, where the Liberal government lost an election, overwhelmingly, because of bad policies, both fiscal and social, and those that are affecting middle-income families, all families, for that matter, and we will not stand for it. We want that information, and Canadians deserve to see it.

● (1600)

Mr. Francis Drouin (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I find it appalling that this particular member attacks the Minister of Finance and the Prime Minister, when he knows full well that the leader of the official opposition has practically stayed in subsidized housing for his entire parliamentary life. It is appalling that he would go this low with politics in this place.

However, I will ask if the member has read the document entitled "Estimated Results of the Federal Carbon Pollution Pricing System". Has he read the document?

Mr. John Brassard: Mr. Speaker, actually, we have read the document, and we referred to it. I referred to it in my speech as propaganda of the government.

What we are talking about here today are internal documents as well that have been passed between departments, because the government knows how much it is going to cost Canadian families. The Liberals know, or they should know, because they are asking us, in the budget, to pass a carbon tax, and none of us know the actual cost of that carbon tax to the average Canadian family. We are asking the government to release that information.

There is no taxation without representation. We cannot make these types of decisions unless we and Canadians know what the cost is. They know what the cost is. Release that information.

On the issue of personal attacks, the member did a pretty good job of it as well.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Pierre Nantel (Longueuil—Saint-Hubert, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I would first like to congratulate my colleague from Barrie—Innisfil, whom I hold in high regard, for his speech and for providing a point of view definitely held by people elsewhere in the country. There is no doubt about that.

I truly appreciate his arguments and his approach to different issues. I understand that the figures must have come out, but I would still like to know what the environmental cost of doing nothing would be, if any. A carbon tax is an incentive that encourages businesses to reduce their carbon footprint and clean up emissions.

Is there something else we could do? For example, has the member heard of a cleaner way to develop the tar sands? Is that something he would like to see? I suppose I should use the term "oil sands" to eliminate the negative connotation.

Currently, this energy source is a monster emitter since domestic natural gas is used to heat the water, create steam, and extract the oil from the sand. Could he propose a solution other than this incentive, which is a proven solution?

● (1605)

[*English*]

Mr. John Brassard: Mr. Speaker, the issue of the oil sands comes up quite regularly. I know, in speaking with our shadow minister for natural resources, who has a tremendous amount of experience in the oil sands, that nowhere in the world is there a more sustainable or environmentally sustainable way of extracting oil from the ground than in the oil sands. That has been an issue that has been argued time and time again and has been proven to be the case.

To the point of an alternative, we hear the environment minister stand up and ask all the time, "where is their plan?" We are going to develop a plan. In fact, we are in the process of developing a plan. This is a plan that is not going to cost the average Canadian family for the basic necessities of life. It is going to be a sustainable plan. In fact, during the previous government, we saw emissions go down.

Those targets the government is now looking to implement are the same targets of the previous government. I do not know whether it was a faux pas on the part of the environment minister, but during question period, she said that they were not going to meet their targets either. Clearly, the government has no intention of reaching those targets. The only thing the Liberals plan to do is tax Canadians disproportionately, especially those who can least afford the carbon tax.

[*Translation*]

Mr. William Amos (Pontiac, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to have a chance to speak, and I will be sharing my time with the member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell.

[*English*]

Canadians understand that polluting the air we breathe and the earth and the oceans that feed us must come at a cost to those who pollute. That is because they incur real costs for all Canadians. These costs are incurred through drought, smog, wild fires, and the effects pollution has on water, food, and the air we breathe. The price we pay is for our health and our future. The financial costs of pollution for Canadians are also very real. Last year in the Pontiac, my constituents felt it first-hand with the floods that ravaged our region.

Climate change alone is expected to cost Canadians $5 billion a year by 2020. We know that pricing pollution is the most effective way to reduce the emissions that bring about these costs, because it creates incentives for businesses and households to innovate and pollute less. That is why putting a price on carbon pollution is so central to our government's plan to fight climate change while at the same time growing the economy, creating jobs for the middle class and those working so hard to join it, and creating a better future for all Canadians.

The idea here is really simple, and the average Canadian does understand this. We are putting a price on what we do not want, which is carbon pollution, and we are fostering that which we do want, lower emissions and job creation through innovation in the clean economy. We are putting this plan into place through the greenhouse gas pollution pricing act. With this legislation, the carbon price will be fair and it will be effective. It is based on a practical approach to minimize the impact on the competitiveness of large industries that are emissions intensive.

I want to assure the hon. members on both sides of this House that this legislation was not developed in isolation. We know that it was developed through collaboration. We know that it was developed in consultation with the provinces, the territories, and indigenous people. Hand in hand, we have worked towards this plan, and it is an important part of our pan-Canadian framework on clean growth and climate change. I want to commend the environment minister for her hard work with colleagues across the country to achieve this.

This framework is our plan, developed to meet our emissions reduction targets, to grow the economy, and to build resilience to a changing climate. To support the implementation of this plan, our approach provides provinces and territories with the flexibility to choose between systems: an explicit price-based system, or a cap and trade system.

A price on carbon pollution, as we all know, is already in place in four provinces: Ontario, Quebec, British Columbia, and Alberta. These provinces encompass over 80% of the Canadian population. In jurisdictions that do not have a pricing system that meets the federal standard, a federal pricing system will apply as of January 1, 2019, starting at a price of $20 per tonne of emissions.

It is important to note that the direct revenue from the carbon price on pollution under the federal system will go back to the province or territory of origin. I would like to point out to those who suggest that a price on carbon pollution will somehow negatively impact the financial health of Canadians that those provinces that already have a price on carbon pollution are, together, leading the rest of Canada in job growth. We are confident that we are going to see the same positive economic performance in other provinces and territories that have yet to implement carbon pricing systems.

I want to focus on the fact that the majority of Canadians understand this already, despite the misinformation from our colleagues in the Conservative Party. The majority of Canadians support this approach. My constituents in the Pontiac support it, and experts support it. There is a strong consensus among economists, scientists, governments around the world, and policy experts that a price on carbon is the single most important policy a government can put in place to deal with climate change.

I would like to take a moment to go to some of the comments I have heard from the Insurance Bureau of Canada, an obviously non-partisan institution that is an expert on the impacts climate change is presently having on our economy. The Insurance Bureau of Canada has publicly stated, repeatedly, that climate change is already costing Canadian taxpayers and home insurance policyholders billions of dollars every year. It has sounded the alarm. Climate change is not some future threat but is very real and a clear and present danger. It has stated publicly that the cost of pricing carbon is dwarfed by the future cost Canadians will face if we do nothing at all.

● (1610)

Here are its facts.

Residential property losses from severe weather have accelerated due to climate change and now total over $1 billion a year on average. Federal disaster relief losses also now average over $1 billion per year, and they continue to escalate, largely driven by climate change. Those are federal numbers only, and they do not even include the losses by provinces and municipalities. I can tell members that in the Pontiac last year, there were millions of dollars lost in property damage and public infrastructure damage due to flooding.

As a result of these rising losses, municipalities across the country are investing heavily in adaptation. The City of Toronto alone is investing $1.5 billion to upgrade its stormwater infrastructure to protect residents from the growing threat. Obviously, in the riding that I represent, in the City of Gatineau and over 40 municipalities in rural Pontiac, we are talking about millions of dollars of new investments to protect our communities.

At the end of the day, whether it is taxpayers or insured policyholders, it is the same Canadians who are now bearing the costs of our past inaction on climate change. When I say "our past inaction", I also mean the party opposite's past inaction. The Conservative government did literally nothing to get our country moving on the right track on this file. That is one of the major reasons that I sought to become elected back in 2015.

With respect, politicians who say that they believe that we have to do something about climate change but not by using a carbon price are no better than those who deny that humans cause climate change or that gravity exists. Frankly, Canadians have no time for one-sided populist rhetoric, the kind of rhetoric that we are hearing from the opposite side right now, and they have no time for the lame partisanship that dumbs down a very serious and important policy debate.

Climate change is the single most important threat that we are facing in the world today and the science is clear that humans are causing it. If the Conservative Party of Canada has a real alternative to carbon pricing that would be effective, I would love to hear it. However, we know from experience that vague promises and ineffective voluntary actions are going to do nothing to reduce greenhouse gases. The Conservative Party opposite has no plan. It has no plan apart from some specious attempt to score political points on the backs of Canadians. It has no plan apart from a desire to divide and misinform Canadians.

I would like to point to the *Globe and Mail* editorial from a couple of months ago. It inspired me, and I thank this publication for stating this. It states:

> ...Canadians like carbon pricing when it does precisely what it is meant to do. But they tune out and focus on other priorities when carbon pricing is portrayed as... [a] costly, anti-oil and job-killing by populist politicians.

> It's all too easy to turn carbon pricing into a populist wedge issue, when in fact it is a sensible and centrist....carbon strategy, under which the...[federal government] will impose a $10 per tonne obligation later this year (rising to $50 in 2022) on jurisdictions that don't come up with an equivalent policy.

It also said that the federal government, with respect to its national carbon strategy, under which the feds will impose this $10 per tonne obligation, will be returning the money collected to the province from where it came.

It further stated:

> More than anything, what Canada needs is for politicians who understand and believe in carbon pricing to defend it vigorously and fearlessly. It's tough to do battle with populists who sloganize about "job-killing" carbon taxes. But they are wrong, and this is a fight worth winning.

That is from the *Globe and Mail* editorial. I thank it for saying that because it is an adult voice in the room. We, the Liberal Party, this government, has a plan. We have a plan to reduce our greenhouse gas emissions by 30% below 2005 levels by 2030, to 517 megatonnes. Along with all the other measures in Canada's clean growth and climate action plan, the pan-Canadian framework for carbon pricing will put Canada on track to meet our 2030 emissions targets, which will help meet our commitments to the global community. This is so fundamental, because greenhouse gases know no national boundaries. By putting a price on carbon, we are going to join 67 other jurisdictions that have already taken this important step. According to the World Bank, those overseas jurisdictions together represent half of the global economy and more than a quarter of global GHG emissions. Therefore, together we are going to make the world a better place. To act otherwise would be a total dereliction of our duty as federal lawmakers.

● (1615)

It would be a dereliction of my duty as the representative of Pontiac, and as a father of two children. It would be a betrayal of our children, our grandchildren, and of generations to come.

In closing, I would simply like to say that with our climate plan we are building on these successes for a cleaner environment and a more prosperous future for all Canadians. I appreciate the opportunity to deliver these views from Pontiac.

Mr. Earl Dreeshen (Red Deer—Mountain View, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it was interesting that the hon. member did talk about the $10 carbon tax that is coming now as it goes up to $50. Of course, the PBO's April 2018 economic outlook talked about that. It also talked about the cost as far as agriculture was concerned.

With the information that had actually come from the ag census 2016, as well as the national inventory report of 2017, where they took an average farm. I have the information on an average farm for Alberta and one for Prince Edward Island. Basically, the costs for a farm in Alberta of about 855 acres and a farm in P.E.I. of about 323 acres, starts off in 2018 in Alberta that it will cost $3,464, and it continues up to 2022 to $17, 321 that it will cost that farm. In P.E.I. it goes from $2,500 this coming year up to $12,446.

The Liberals always say there is an opportunity for that to then go to the consumer. However, that is not exactly how agriculture works. It is going to stay on the farm. They are the ones who are going to be dealing with that. I am sure if a person did a little extra work, they could probably figure out what the actual costs will be for every family as well, but these are usually farm families who are associated with this. They will also have the added numbers that we are not able to get from the government.

I wonder if the member could talk about the damage that is going to happen to farm families and farmers in general, without talking about some of the other talking points that they have, and how they are helping out in the farming industry by dealing with environmental issues.

● (1620)

Mr. William Amos: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the question. It is always a pleasure as the member for Pontiac to speak about farmers. The single largest economic group of contributors to our region is the agricultural sector. I know that they are sensible people, and they know full well the damage that is being wrought by climate change right now. Everyone understands when floods ravage crops. Last year was a very difficult year for Pontiac farmers. It was very difficult to get the crops seeded and have a successful year. That is a direct result of changing weather patterns.

We need to be responsible about this. The federal government with its pricing system has made it very clear that all direct revenues will be going right back to the provinces, and the provinces are free to give the farmers what they need in order to deal with different costs associated with the price on carbon.

It is absolutely possible for farmers to be treated justly and fairly, and that is part of our plan.

Mr. Scott Duvall (Hamilton Mountain, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member mentioned that the Liberals believe in a clean environment. We on this side of the House believe in that also. That is why we have to go forward.

The problem we are having is understanding why the Prime Minister is making contradictory statements. On one hand, he is committed to meeting ambitious environmental targets, and on the other he keeps giving billions of dollars away to oil and gas companies. How does he plan to meet his commitments to the international community?

Mr. William Amos: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate we have a shared vision of the need to put a price on carbon. What I would say is the following. The Prime Minister has been very clear that we need to grow our economy, while at the same time protecting our environment. These go hand in hand.

The simple fact is that Canadians cannot be treated for fools. There is absolutely no such thing as dealing with climate change in the absence of having a broader perspective on what it takes to grow jobs for the middle class. A price on carbon is absolutely core to the system.

While the opposition, with respect, is engaging in all sorts of false debates around what an investment in the Trans Mountain pipeline project is all about, it is distracting from a much more important policy issue, which is how we are going to ensure that Canada integrates a price on pollution so that all economic actors are able to contribute in an appropriate way to a cleaner and greener economy.

Mr. Francis Drouin (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the member for Carleton's motion is interesting, but one that seems to miss the point on at least two levels. First, as has been pointed out in the House before, pricing carbon pollution is widely acknowledged as one of the most important tools for combatting climate change. That is because it follows a classic economic principle. If we want to encourage certain kinds of activity, provide an incentive for doing more of it. If we want to discourage an activity such as producing carbon, we create a disincentive so that there is less of it. This is well understood because it just makes sense.

It is certainly understood by the more than 42 countries that have adopted some form of carbon pricing. It is understood by some 25 subnational jurisdictions that have done the same. Indeed, the number of carbon pricing initiatives that have been implemented or planned for implementation has almost doubled since 2013. Among those pricing or planning to price carbon are the European Union, China, the Republic of Korea, Singapore, Colombia, and California, just to name a few.

In the case of China, that country has tested a cap-and-trade system in nine of its 23 provinces. The plan is to take the system national and when that happens, fully one-quarter of the world's carbon emissions will be priced at one level or another. The opposition increasingly finds itself on the outside looking in, outside of a growing consensus sweeping the globe, outside of the economic mainstream that wants to discourage the production of carbon by pricing it, outside of nation after nation and state after state that know that this is the best, most effective way to reduce carbon pollution.

Nor is it just governments that have seen the wisdom of putting a price on carbon, so too have companies. Indeed, the private sector, that same private sector that the opposition claims to understand and represent, has been calling on governments to price carbon for years. Many are not waiting. By last year, more than 1,300 companies had implemented or were planning to implement internal carbon pricing. That is up from 150 just four years ago.

Why is that? If pricing carbon pollution is so devastating, why are companies jumping on board? What do they know that the opposition does not? They understand the benefits to their businesses. They know that it is the best way of achieving the desired public policy objective of reducing greenhouse gas emissions. That is the free market in action. That is how forward-thinking companies are dealing with the challenges and opportunities of climate change. They are turning the genius of free enterprise to finding creative and innovative ways to avoid disincentives. Again, it is just Economics 101.

Our government believes in the free market system. By sending clear market signals, we are unleashing its power to tackle greenhouse gas emissions, spurring innovation and improving our competitiveness.

These clear market signals do something else as well. They encourage companies to look for better ways of doing things including using different sources of energy and using less energy overall. That is critical, because the International Energy Agency has said that we can get halfway to our Paris commitments just by using energy more efficiently.

I would also remind the House that pricing carbon pollution is something that the United Nations is championing. It has challenged companies to "reach the next level of climate performance and to advocate for a price on carbon as a necessary and effective measure to tackle the climate change challenge."

Why is this obvious to everyone but members of the opposition? Why do they not get it? Why do they not see what everyone else does, that pricing carbon pollution must be part of the solution to climate change?

That is the first problem with this motion, it misses the point by missing the boat, by opposing a tool that the world is embracing.

Second, it misses the point by overlooking one of the key features of our carbon pricing proposal, that revenue from pricing pollution will not end up in Ottawa. All direct revenues collected by our government will be returned to the province or territory they came from.

● (1625)

Governments in Canada today are investing carbon pricing revenues in rebates and tax cuts for households. They are supporting competitiveness for industry and investing in climate action, clean technology, and innovation. Those are the kinds of wise investments our government is making today.

We are supporting new electricity infrastructure and smart grids, clean power like wind and solar, hydro, geothermal, and biomass. We are building healthier communities and creating new economic opportunities by developing alternatives to diesel. We are investing in electric and alternative fuel charging stations and more energy efficient homes.

Investments like these will take us closer to the future we want: a country defined by innovation, ingenuity, and clean technology. It is a future that is within our grasp, not by clinging to the past but by embracing the future, not by opposing just for the sake of opposing but by recognizing the world has seen the virtues of carbon pricing, and it is pressing ahead.

It has been said that an error does not become a mistake until one refuses to correct it. The opposition has erred in standing against pricing carbon pollution. It is time to correct it.

I invite members opposite to join with us, to join with countries and companies from around the world, and to join with the United Nations to help build a better and cleaner future for our children and the generations to come.

Mr. Dave MacKenzie (Oxford, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the member for Pontiac said that greenhouse gas emissions know no national boundary. I think everyone in the House recognizes that is true.

My riding is very agricultural but also very industrial. There are two automotive plants and a lot of suppliers to the automotive industry. I wonder if the member opposite could tell me about the carbon tax in Michigan, Ohio, New York, and Pennsylvania. These are all states that end up getting our cheap electricity because of the green energy policy in Ontario and are now competing with our industry. Does the member recognize that we will be putting ourselves at a terrible disadvantage?

The people of Ontario spoke very loudly in Ontario last week. Does he have any thoughts on that whole issue?

● (1630)

Mr. Francis Drouin: Mr. Speaker, I have a lot of farmers back home, which is in Ontario. The Prime Minister and the Minister of Environment have heard them loud and clear. Should the Ford government decide to cancel carbon pricing, I can reassure them that the federal program on a price on carbon will not impact farmers.

Why is the opposition pressing us to vote here tonight? Are we going to continue hearing empty rhetoric with empty chairs? How many Conservative members will be here tonight?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Pierre Nantel (Longueuil—Saint-Hubert, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague from Glengarry—Prescott—Russell for his speech.

Unfortunately, I think the Liberals are going to have to make an effort to explain their point of view. In his speech, the member said we need to send clear market signals. I am lost for words, because buying a leaky, overpriced pipeline does not send a clear market signal that things are changing in Canada.

If this government really wants to ensure that economic development goes hand in hand with natural resource development, it needs to show us that it is making progress on promoting cleaner extraction methods. This is a dialogue of the deaf. Some members are saying we must not implement a scary carbon tax, while others are saying we should implement it and then going off and buying pipelines.

Can we get some nuanced thinking? Could someone in the government tell us what the cleanest options for oil sands development are? I never hear anything about that, and buying a pipeline certainly does not send a clear market signal.

Mr. Francis Drouin: Mr. Speaker, I can assure my colleague that our approach is well balanced. If we told the Albertans tomorrow morning that we were going to shut down all the oil plants, I do not think they would be happy. Telling a family they will be out of a job tomorrow morning does not work. We need to rally all Canadians, which is why I believe in the approach taken by the Minister of Environment, who quite rightly said we need to put a price on carbon while growing the economy.

[*English*]

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it has been a very interesting day. The Conservatives constantly say that they want to know more about the numbers. The numbers they are asking for were created when they were in government. They want numbers that they would have had when they were in government. That tells me they did not read the information they were provided.

Today the minister provided another document, which was made available publicly back on April 1. Could my colleague comment on the shear nonsense of not enough information being there? It is there, if they are prepared to read it.

Mr. Francis Drouin: Mr. Speaker, I have a document that lists all the information in response to the questions of the official opposition members. They should take the time to read it. It takes about five minutes. It outlines all the information they are looking for.

[*Translation*]

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): It is my duty pursuant to Standing Order 38 to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: the hon. member for Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan, Foreign Affairs; and the hon. member for Calgary Shepard, Health.

* * *

[*English*]

POINTS OF ORDER

DRAFT APPROPRIATION BILL—MAIN ESTIMATES, 2018-19

Mr. Daniel Blaikie (Elmwood—Transcona, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I am rising to address the point of order that was raised earlier today by the member for Edmonton West. I understand that there have been a few interventions on this point so far today, so I am happy to make a contribution to that debate on the part of the NDP.

Earlier today, the hon. parliamentary secretary to the government House leader referred to a Standing Order that said that the appropriation bill had to be based on the estimates, and had quite a loose interpretation of what "based" meant.

There are a few other authorities I would like to cite to you, Mr. Speaker, to help you in your deliberations, which show that the relationship between the estimates document and the appropriation bill has to be much tighter than what the parliamentary secretary to the government House leader has suggested.

House of Commons Practice and Procedures, third edition, page 864, reads:

> Each budgetary item, or vote, has two essential components: an amount of money and a destination...Should the government wish to change the approved amount or destination of a vote, it must do so either by way of a supplementary estimate or by way of new or amending legislation.

The "destination" is the wording of the vote.

That makes it very clear that there is a way the government can change the destination, or wording of a vote, but it is not to do it willy-nilly between when those estimates are reported back by committee and the introduction of the appropriation bill, that there is a separate process.

Page 865 of *House of Commons Practice and Procedures*, third edition, reads:

> Estimates, outlines spending according to departments, agencies and programs and contains the proposed wording of the conditions governing spending which Parliament will be asked to approve. This information directly supports the schedule of the related appropriation act.

In this case, the schedule of the appropriation act and the wording specifically for Treasury Board Secretariat vote 40 is different than what was presented in the estimates. Therefore, that means committees did not have the opportunity to study that destination. Therefore, vote 40 in the appropriation act is out of order.

I would remind you, Mr. Speaker, of some of your own recent rulings that have emphasized the importance of the committee study process to the estimates. I quote from your May 29 ruling, where you say:

> When the government presents estimates to the House, each vote contains an amount of money and a destination, which describes the purpose for which the money will be used. In some cases, the description is quite detailed and in other cases it can be rather general. That said, the estimates are referred to committee specifically to allow members to study them in further detail.

However, the wording of this vote was not referred to committee. It has been changed between reporting back from committee and the appropriation act.

I would also remind you, Mr. Speaker, of your ruling on June 11, where you say:

> ...it is up to the government to determine the form its request for funds will take. It is for members to decide, in studying and voting on the estimates, whether or not the money should be granted. In the case of vote 40, some members may wish that the request had been in a different form. In the end, they are left to make a decision on the request as the government has presented it.

The way the government presented that request to committee and the way that request was structured when it was studied was one thing. Now it is another thing in the appropriation act. While you have rightly said, Mr. Speaker, that the government has some latitude in determining the form that the request will take initially, that does not mean the government has freedom once it has decided on the form of that request and sent it to committee and they have been deemed reported back, that the government then has a wide-ranging prerogative to change the nature of that request for funding, which is what is happening currently in the appropriation bill as it is worded.

● (1635)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): I thank the hon. member. The information is duly noted and I am sure it will be part of the considerations.

Resuming debate, the hon. member for Central Okanagan—Similkameen—Nicola.

* * *

BUSINESS OF SUPPLY

OPPOSITION MOTION—CARBON PRICING

The House resumed consideration of the motion.

Mr. Dan Albas (Central Okanagan—Similkameen—Nicola, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I will be sharing my time with the member for Calgary Nose Hill.

As always, it is an honour to rise in this place to represent my constituents.

This is an important topic. It is not a secret that the Liberal government believes strongly in its carbon tax. In fact, the Prime Minister has extended, some would say overextended, all of his political capital to create a national carbon tax for all of Canada, or almost all of Canada. One province has refused, another just rejected it, and possibly more will be rejecting it after upcoming elections.

That is ultimately the problem, because the whole theory to carbon tax is that when people become so financially crippled that they can no longer afford to buy gasoline, they will in turn use less of it. By extension, they will burn less carbon, and that will lower our greenhouse gas emissions.

Even where a carbon tax has existed the longest, which is in my home province of British Columbia, greenhouse gas emissions continue to rise. Many say that means it is a failure. The elites and the experts will say it is failing only because the carbon tax is not nearly high enough.

The Prime Minister was quoted as saying that high gas prices "are exactly what we want". He meant specifically to encourage people to financially suffer to the point where they can no longer afford to buy gasoline, and thus use less of it.

Here is the problem with that theory: democracy. I would submit to this place that when people are pushed to the brink of not being able to afford things like gasoline that they need in their everyday lives, and this applies to all of society, they will vote out the carbon tax.

This is a big part of what happened in the recent Ontario election. Gerald Butts' fingerprints are all over Ontario for driving up costs on everyday Canadians. It is not a secret that he is now following the same formula while running the federal Liberal government. Let us look at this motion as an example.

The entire premise for a carbon tax to work is that prices get so high people can no longer afford to use as much gasoline. The federal Liberal government has in its possession documents that clearly show how much the Department of Finance believes this national carbon tax will cost Canadian families. What does Gerald Butts do? He orders that this information be kept secret from the very Canadians who will be forced to pay it. Why is that? Let me ask the question another way.

When Canadians are told that the government is hiding information from them related to a tax that they are being forced to pay, what will they say in response? Every person in this room knows the answer to that question. They will say it enrages them, especially when it comes from a Prime Minister who had promised to be "Mr. Transparency".

What was that quote again? Oh yes, "sunlight is the best disinfectant". Where is the sunlight here? It seems to have gone the way of sunny ways.

Here is the other thing, though. It is not just everyday Canadians. Here is another example I will share from a different perspective. In 2008, at the time the B.C. carbon tax was first introduced, basically 100% of all cement used in British Columbia was manufactured in British Columbia. Why not? Concrete is not exactly a lightweight, inexpensive product to import and then transport to other jurisdictions.

What happened when B.C.-produced concrete became subject to a carbon tax in 2008? Well, naturally, it became more expensive. By 2014, B.C.-produced concrete only accounted for roughly 65% of all concrete used in British Columbia, because cheaper concrete was being imported from jurisdictions with no carbon tax. That is a 35% loss of market share in B.C.'s own market.

As a result of this, the B.C. government is now providing provincial subsidies to the B.C. concrete industry. There actually is a term for this now, and it is called carbon leakage.

● (1640)

Here is how carbon leakage is defined in the B.C. NDP 2018 budget document:

> ...industries that compete with industry in countries that may have low or no carbon price. If BC industry loses market share to more polluting competitors, known as carbon leakage, it affects our economy and does not reduce global greenhouse gas emissions.

This is a flat-out admission that carbon taxes do not work because they create carbon leakage. Where do members think the term "carbon leakage" is found in the budget document? Subsidies and exemptions cost everyday taxpayers money.

Where is the carbon leakage exemption for the average hard-working Canadian family? We all know there is no carbon tax exemption or relief for anything. Heck, the current Liberal government will not even tell people how much it will cost them. This is why the member for Carleton has put this motion forward.

What is this Prime Minister afraid of? Is he afraid that if Canadians learn the true costs of his carbon tax, they might not vote for him in the next election? Is he worried his brand might take another hit at the polls? Surely, for a Liberal government whose number one favourite talking point is that the environment and the economy go hand in hand, one would think the Liberals would be proud to release the true costs of what they say will save the environment. This Prime Minister tells us that the carbon tax is necessary to save the environment, yet when we ask how much greenhouse-gas emissions will actually be reduced because of his carbon tax, he cannot say.

To recap, Canadians are basically being told that yes, the Liberals are making them pay a carbon tax; no, they will not tell them how much it will cost them, and no, they cannot tell them how much it will reduce greenhouse gas emissions either. Seriously, is it any wonder a growing number of Canadians are opposing and rejecting this carbon tax? Most of them have never even heard of carbon leakage or the fact that large-scale industrial greenhouse gas emitters are increasingly getting an exemption or a subsidy from the carbon tax while there is nothing for the average Canadian.

Fortunately, in this case we know that the Office of the Information Commissioner has now launched an investigation to determine why the data about the financial costs of a carbon tax per household are not being released to Canadians. We also know that this Prime Minister does not have a super-stellar record with independent officers of Parliament, typically because he believes he can do whatever he wants without consequence and regardless of the rules.

In this case, there is what is right and what is wrong. If the members of the current Liberal government believe strongly in their carbon tax, and I believe that many of them strongly do, then they should not be afraid to tell Canadians what the Department of Finance officials believe this carbon tax will cost them. That is the right thing to do. Sadly, all we know is that the government has once again whipped its members into doing precisely what Mr. Butts wants them to do, and that is to hide the cost of the carbon tax from Canadians.

I do not really believe members on the government side do not see the problem with hiding the most basic information from Canadians on a signature policy from this Prime Minister. We can only surmise that the information is being hidden because the Prime Minister has his own reasons to do so. I suppose if the current Liberal government wants to hide the true cost of its policies from Canadians who are left to pay the bills, so be it.

I disagree with that type of governance. I would encourage all members of this place to send a message to this Prime Minister and his inner circle, asking them to be that ray of sunshine, to serve as the disinfectant, to provide transparency, and to support this motion from the hon. member for Carleton.

These are important debates. Let us not shy away from sharing the information and then letting Canadians pick a side. When people are told what the situation is, given the information so they can digest it, and hear from both views, they are in the best position to make that choice. Every election cycle, we trust them to make the right choice. I believe the people are never wrong. What is wrong with letting the people of this House and of this country have that information, and letting them decide whom they want to believe and which policy is in our national interest?

● (1645)

Mr. Peter Fragiskatos (London North Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, what we should not shy away from in this House is telling the people of Canada how we feel about climate change.

I have a simple two-part question for the member. First, how does he feel about climate change? Does he believe that it is actually happening? Is the planet getting warmer? Second, to what extent does human activity have to do with this phenomenon?

Mr. Dan Albas: Mr. Speaker, it is very easy to answer this question.

First of all, I do not have feelings about climate change because, again, I believe science. If we look at the science and modelling, there are some inconsistencies, but I believe there is a broad consensus among scientists that 2°C of increased temperature across the globe may happen. We cannot say when, and we also cannot say that a particular event was or was not caused because of human activity. Again, our modelling does not allow that. However, I will say that we do understand human behaviour. We actually have a discipline called economics. We actually can tell what the average cost is of a tax, whether it be an income tax on an average family, whether it be a carbon tax. That information is available to the Department of Finance and to the Minister of Finance.

We actually have a redacted report showing that after the election the Liberals received that exact briefing, yet the information has been blacked out, making it difficult for members of Parliament like myself to be able to look constituents in the eye and tell them that we know what the implications of this tax are.

If we care about this country, then we should be able to trust the people on both sides of the aisle to have that information so we can debate on a level playing field, which I hope the member supports.

● (1650)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): I want to remind hon. members that they can have notes and papers with them, but when they display them, they become props and that is frowned upon.

Questions and comments, the hon. member for Courtenay—Alberni.

Mr. Gord Johns (Courtenay—Alberni, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I have a lot of respect for my friend from British Columbia.

He knows as well as I do that in the last five years we have had record forest fires raging through the province of British Columbia and through the province of Alberta. In my home community, we have had drought and flooding which is costing our communities significant amounts of money. The PBO is projecting that it is going to cost us $5 billion a year by 2020, and $90 billion by 2050, if we do not mitigate the impacts of climate change. This issue is real.

I did not hear my friend and colleague talk about solutions and ways forward in tackling climate change. We both come from British Columbia, where the provincial Liberal government under Gordon Campbell actually took leadership. It is one of the things that I will actually give them credit for. Back in 2008, the provincial government implemented their first carbon tax. That government was primarily federal Conservatives under a provincial banner. I am sure the member will agree with me on that. In fact, the Green-NDP coalition has just increased it by another $5. The carbon tax is at $35.

That is not what is causing the biggest impact on middle-class Canadians. I would say that people throughout British Columbia would like to see further action to address climate change because of these historic events that we have never seen before in terms of flooding and forest fires, and climate change.

Maybe the member could speak about solutions. What are the Conservatives proposing?

Mr. Dan Albas: Mr. Speaker, first of all, the Conservatives are saying that if the government wants to tax, then it needs to give parliamentarians the information so we can debate it and let Canadians decide. That is number one. That is the main focus of today's debate.

Number two, the member may recall that I actually said that the B. C. NDP government in the 2018 budget actually referred to carbon leakage as being a concern. The pulp and paper mills in British Columbia are very carbon sensitive. Again, that increase from $30 to $35 is already having a remarkable impact on their ability to compete internationally. I believe that this will now be juxtaposed against extra subsidies to those industries. They are setting that context.

When it comes to climate change, there are a lot of other questions that we may have. John Tirole, who is a Nobel Prize economist, has said before that when a country such as Canada, or even a province such as British Columbia, puts a dollar of effort against climate change, but we only account for 2% of the total emissions around the world, that is like saying we will put in a dollar and two cents will go into a savings account to help fight it. What we are doing is we are actually paying the free-riders of countries that do not have those laws and regulations.

We need to have a discussion about how the world is working on this and, to tell the truth, the non-binding mandate of the Paris Agreement allows for countries to make pledges that they may not have any intention of meeting. There are a lot of things to unpack in that question. I would say, let us start in our legislative assemblies in the provinces and here in Parliament, and give parliamentarians the information, so that we can actually have the proper debate.

● (1655)

Hon. Michelle Rempel (Calgary Nose Hill, CPC): Mr. Speaker, there is a principle that many of us abide by, certainly on this side of the aisle, and that is no taxation without representation. That is essentially the function of Parliament at this point in time. If we are going to tax the people we represent, then we are accountable to them for how we spend their money. We should be able to explain what sort of impact collecting revenue from them and then spending it will have on their lives.

The situation that is at the core of the motion today is that the government has implemented a very punitive tax on Canadians and is taxing them without information. We have taxation without information. Let me explain what I am talking about.

There was a departmental note entitled "Impact of a carbon price on households' consumption costs across the income distribution". It was presented to the Liberal government after the election. The Conservative Party of Canada asked for a copy of the document, because ostensibly it is what the government's carbon tax is predicated on.

Again, the government made a decision to impose a tax on Canadians. This is the information it provided about what the cost would be to average households. As the opposition, we should be able to have that information so that we can represent our constituents and see whether this policy instrument will work and what the opportunity cost would be, the cost of taking that money from Canadians through the tax. What would be the return on investment for seeing the cost of goods increase?

I will post this document on my website or my Facebook page later today. When we got it, it was completely redacted. It essentially says, "The cost to Canadian households will be—" and then there is a giant redacted table. It is completely blacked out.

That is the core of the motion today. In order for the House to represent the people who gave us a mandate to be here, and in order to decide whether or not this tax is actually in the best interests of Canadians, we should know the modelling that the government used to determine whether the tax should be implemented now.

Based on what I have seen, external economists outside of the public service have certainly said that the carbon tax is going to raise the cost of goods and everything. Let us think about this. Canada is a very large country. It is geographically diverse. We have to travel long distances to get from one place to another. I am thinking about all the people in this place who have to commute from their ridings just to get to Parliament. Never mind the fact that we are agriculture-intensive and a large portion of our economy is based on natural resource extraction. What do all those things use as an input? They use carbon.

I could spend a whole day just talking about the impact on industry and the loss of jobs, but we can push that down to the household level. Because we have to fill up our cars, and because it is cold here and we have to heat our homes, that tax is going to increase the cost to the average Canadian household. Anyone here who has seen the price of gas these days and who makes that puckering sound or shivers when putting gas in the car understands that the carbon tax is impacting people.

One of my colleagues got up and waxed eloquent about economics, about supply and demand. He argued that if we put a tax on something, people's demand for it will decrease. What he was arguing was that the carbon tax the Liberals have put in place would actually decrease the demand of Canadians for things like gas, heating, and farm implements.

Here is the problem. The other piece of information the Liberals have that they will not release is the assumption about how much demand will decrease. They are not releasing how much this carbon tax would actually reduce demand. Therefore, we have a double problem here. Anyone who is making that cringing face when filling up the tank right now is still filling up the tank. Why is that? It is because we are in Canada. We have to drive to get to places.

● (1700)

The price the Liberals have put in place is not going to decrease the demand, but it is going to increase the cost of living for average Canadians. That is the reason why the government will not release this information. It does not want taxation with information. It does not want taxation with representation. Why? It is because the government has a dogmatic, almost religious, zealotry adherence to the carbon tax it has put in place.

Why is that? It is because its spending is so out of control and its deficit budget is so unimaginably high that it is looking at every possible option to squeeze average Canadians for its poor financial management. It is my job, and the job of everyone else sitting on this side of the House, to say, "No, it stops here." We need this information. Canadians need this information. The government did not receive a mandate to be completely disrespectful of the hard-earned money that Canadians toil for every day.

We also understand that this information needs to be used to look at lower-income Canadians. We know that taxes like this have a disproportionately higher cost to people who are making less money. Because they have a lower income and still have the same input costs on things like transit passes, food, and driving, that tax has a higher impact on people like single moms and senior women. That is wrong. That is also our job here, and that is why we need this information. That is why we are prepared to make the government sit here for 24 hours over and over again until it allows taxation with information, not blocks of redacted information. That is ridiculous.

The Minister of Environment, the religious, dogmatic climate change spokesperson-in-chief in the House of Commons, stood up today and with great zeal said that she tabled a document on April 30 that shall set us free, except there is absolutely nothing in her document. Members can go on her website and look through it. There is nothing in there that speaks to the cost to Canadian households. Why? It is because this is how the Liberal government operates. It does not want Canadians looking at its books. Why is that? It is because it is a burning dumpster fire that is adding carbon to our environment.

Anybody who is filling up the tank right now understands what this carbon tax is going to do for people. If we are going to put a consumption tax that would increase the cost of everything to Canadians, one, it had better work, which it does not, and two, Canadians had better buy into it, which they do not. The other thing is that the government would have to account for the fact that it is going to have legal challenges from virtually every province in this country saying no. Every provincial government is going to stand in the way of this carbon tax. I am so pleased to see Ontarians, and soon Albertans, rejecting another barrier to doing business.

In closing, let us talk about trade. The government should have been making Canada more competitive, knowing the volatility of the American administration going into the NAFTA talks. What did it do? It put a cash grab in place, making it even more uncertain for investment, which means even more lost jobs.

I want that information. Every Canadian has a right to know what was in that document. Canadians have a right to know how much this tax is going to impact them. If we do not do that, if we do not have taxation with representation, then why do any of us have jobs? That government should not.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the member across the way should be aware that while she was in cabinet, the Conservatives actually had the information she is talking about. I do not know if they did not read it, or if they are intentionally trying to mislead the House. Then, we have a document that was tabled by the minister today, which was released well over a month ago. The information is there if they are prepared to look.

In regard to the specifics, 80%-plus of Canadians already pay a price on pollution. The Conservatives know that. The member used the example of those who use transit or those who are disadvantaged. A province can provide a subsidy. A good example is the Province of Manitoba, where the Conservative government cut back on Winnipeg transit transfer money. If that transit money is reinstated, the city would not have to increase the cost of fares. Keeping the fares down means that more people are able to afford them. It is up to the provinces. For many of the answers the members across the way want, they need to go to the provinces, maybe run as MLAs or MPPs, and they might be able to get those specific answers.

● (1705)

Hon. Michelle Rempel: Mr. Speaker, first of all, the Conservative government did not impose a carbon tax, a tax on everything. In fact, it proudly stood against it. The leader of my party has stood up and said that a Conservative government does not want to raise taxes on Canadians; it wants them to have more money in their pockets so they can make choices. Government does not know best how to spend people's money; they do. That is the difference between the Conservatives and the Liberals.

Let us talk about the Liberals' spending priorities. Every day, we walked by an $8-million hockey rink that was used for about four or five months. How many bus passes would that have paid for in Winnipeg? There were rubber ducks all over the place. There was $200 million spent to facilitate work permits for people illegally crossing the border from the U.S. into Canada. There was $1 million spent for office renovations. There were limo rides. Those are the priorities of the government, and when the Liberals talk about fiscal prudence, I feel like vomiting.

I am so excited for Canadians to reject this ideology and bring Canada back to balance and prosperity. We have had enough of these talking points and obfuscations.

Mr. Gord Johns (Courtenay—Alberni, NDP): Mr. Speaker, one thing I am not hearing enough about today is the cost to taxpayers for natural disasters that are a result of climate change. We have seen record numbers of forest fires. We have seen floods like we have never seen before, which the PBO has projected will cost about $5 billion a year, or more, by 2020. There have been even worse years recently.

Municipalities are trying to brace themselves by building infrastructure or preparing for more forest fires coming down the pipe, but we are not hearing a sense of urgency from the Conservatives. We are not hearing how they are going to deal with these issues and protect middle-class Canadians. Of course, this tax, and being tax-prudent, is protecting taxpayers, because they are the ones who are going to pick up the tab for these disasters.

We have seen solutions. We have seen them in countries like Sweden, which has lowered emissions by 25% through carbon tax initiatives, and it has grown its GDP by 69%, all since 1990. We have gone in the other direction.

I would like to hear more about the answers and about tax prudence in terms of the impacts of climate change on taxpayers.

Hon. Michelle Rempel: Mr. Speaker, the riding of the member for Foothills and my riding suffered a devastating flood in 2013 in Alberta. My colleague and I often talk about a simple question when this point comes up: How much tax does somebody in my colleague's riding have to pay for his riding not to flood again? The argument is that if Canadians pay a certain amount of tax, it is going to prevent a flood. That is completely ludicrous, especially when the tax is not going to reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

Instead of spending $8 million on a hockey rink and $200 million on work permits for illegal border crossers, the government should be trying to balance the budget and invest in flood mitigation infrastructure. Have we heard anything about that? No, we have not, because the infrastructure minister is focused on renovating his office, $1 million for that.

I cannot believe the argument that if something is taxed, it will prevent a forest fire. That is bananas. We need things that actually work, such as investments in infrastructure in the context of a balanced budget. I am done with this rhetoric.

Ms. Linda Duncan (Edmonton Strathcona, NDP): Mr. Speaker, it is a great pleasure to rise to speak to this motion. I am going to say many things that my colleagues from Alberta should hear because it is very important for them to be reminded where this idea of a carbon tax or carbon levy came from.

I am a proud Albertan for many reasons and counted among them is the fact that my province was the first Canadian jurisdiction, in fact the first jurisdiction in North America, to impose a levy on carbon emissions. Our colleagues in the Conservative Party, minus the Progressive Conservative aspect of it, seem to want to forget about that. In fact, my guess would be that not a single one of them mentioned that fact during the debate in this place on the carbon tax. In 2007, Premier Stelmach's Progressive Conservative Government of Alberta became the first in Canada, a North America jurisdiction, to legislate greenhouse gas emissions reductions. The specified gas emitters regulation imposed a carbon levy on large industrial emitters.

This came about because of the remarkable institution in Alberta called the Clean Air Strategic Alliance. It is a mechanism that I have long recommended should be duplicated at the federal level. It is a tripartite organization shared jointly by someone senior in industry, maybe a TransAlta, Suncor, or Syncrude vice-president, and by a deputy of energy or environment, and a senior environmentalist. It also includes indigenous peoples and farmers. On behalf of the Alberta government it takes on what should be done to reduce air emissions in our province. The alliance took on the coal-fired power industry and significantly reduced those emissions. It also took on the major emitters of greenhouse gases and as a result, the government very wisely issued these regulations.

Those regulations have since been replaced and I will talk about that in a minute, but under those regulations, an industry could choose to either reduce its emissions substantially or contribute to a research fund. That research fund was headed up by the former head of Syncrude Canada. It is considered a great model for investment in cleaner technology. A lot of the money went to try to clean up the fossil fuel industry, which some people might question, but it indeed does also need to clean up. A lot of that money also went into things like geothermal energy, renewable energy, using alternative energy in the fossil fuel industry, and reducing the energy used by the fossil fuel industry. It was remarkable.

We really need to honour Alberta for that because Alberta did that first. I find it really stunning in this place that every Conservative keeps standing up and ranting about the very measure that my Government of Alberta put in place.

A decade later, along came the government of Rachel Notley who put in place a very impressive climate action portfolio. She announced a new regime that includes the carbon competitiveness incentive regulations. Those have been in place since January of this year. They apply to facilities like the oil sands, cement plants, fertilizer producers that produce more than 100,000 tonnes of carbon dioxide in 2003 or thereafter. The Notley government also imposed a cap on oil sands carbon emissions and it was great news for me because I volunteered for seven years to finally deal with the emissions from the coal-fired power sector.

Again, I am very proud of Alberta because it has moved forward. The federal government is still talking about it and the federal government acts as if it has done it, but in fact, it has done nothing to change the Harper era coal-fired power regulations.

All the Harper government did was to say that by 2050 the coal-fired power industry either has to shut down or deal with carbon emissions. That was the big push for carbon capture sequestration. Guess what? It is really expensive and with the big push for that, in the end, the industry did not want to pay for it and the public is not happy about subsidizing it. At the big international conferences there are people trying to sell this, but it just did not work in Alberta.

The reason this industry was not shut down earlier in Alberta was that the government refused to look at the health impacts of that sector. I tried really hard to get the federal and provincial governments to speak to it. I eventually had to intervene on my own with a lifelong friend who is a family doctor and who had documented in the Lake Wabamun area, where most of the coal-fired power industry is, the higher rates of multiple sclerosis and other diseases related to neurological disease. As a result of his and my intervening, and our having brought in an American expert from the eastern coast, the government finally put in place the only mercury control regulations in this country for coal-fired power.

● (1710)

Bit by bit, the Government of Alberta was doing good work. Along came the Rachel Notley government and Dr. Joe Vipond, who is a Calgary physician. He started gathering information from the Canadian Medical Association to determine an absolutely huge number of serious illnesses and deaths related to coal-fired power in my province. As a result of that data and as a result of costing those injuries, health impacts, and deaths, a lot of the issues having to do with asthma, lung disease, and heart disease, the government decided that it would move forward the date for the shutdown of coal power in Alberta. Therefore, by 2030 the coal power industry will be gone in Alberta.

Those are great measures by the Government of Alberta, which were initially started by Premier Stelmach, a Progressive Conservative. These regulations replace the specified gas emitters regulation.

I want to share with members the voice of one of my neighbours, who is a remarkable man. He travels around the world and advises China and Bhutan; he goes everywhere. He is an environmental economist. Mark Anielski has reminded us that the health care costs associated with climate change are "in the order of $300 million per year, along with other impacts of pollution", and it is what he dubs an "unfunded liability". He estimates this overall liability is worth "about $13.7 billion if you value carbon at $50 a ton which is what Shell and other companies shadow price carbon at". He added, "This is in the spirit of taxing the bads and not the goods" and "everyone requires a share of responsibility...paying for that liability. But the tax really is an incentive to change our behaviour to be more efficient."

I heard my colleague from Calgary rant about what the gas tax will do to address and stop the floods and terrible fires that have blighted British Columbia, Saskatchewan, and Alberta. That is not the point. The point is we need to reduce the burning of fossil fuels so that we do not have more catastrophic floods and fires. We have been fortunate in Canada because we are not seeing the brunt of it that the rest of the world is already seeing. We need to understand that putting in place a carbon tax is meant as a preventive measure, not an after-the-fact enforcement measure. It is meant to trigger a different behaviour.

The Alberta regime is forecasting $5.8 billion over a three-year period from the carbon levy on large industrial emitters. We need to also recognize that the regimes put in place in each province are going to be different. My province is blessed with, although some people say it is cursed with, major emitters. We have the major oil and gas sector. What that means is if we impose a tax, we are going to generate a lot of revenue. We also have been blessed with having a good number of people earning a good income that is higher than in a lot of places in the country. Therefore, we are going to garner a higher tax revenue. However, most of that tax will be from the purchase and burning of fossil fuels in our homes, in small businesses, and our vehicles.

What will happen with that revenue? Unlike what British Columbia originally did, where it simply returned that tax money, I am glad that Alberta has taken a different direction. My understanding is that under the new B.C. government, it has also shifted over what it is doing with that revenue.

Two-thirds of that revenue is going to be reinvested in the Alberta economy: $1.3 billion in green infrastructure and $300 million in phasing out coal power. The government, in its wisdom, decided to buy out some of the coal industry because, foolishly, previous governments had allowed the coal power industry to expand at a moment in time when we should have known it was going to be phasing out. It has agreed to pay out some of those operations and the power purchase agreements. There will be $600 million going to energy efficiency for homes and businesses, and $1 billion will be going to support the coal communities that have housed the workers who have worked in the coal mines and the coal-fired power plants. That is a good initiative. It will also go into renewable energy investments, and innovation and technology.

● (1715)

I would add here that the Rachel Notley government has also put $50 million toward the retraining of workers in the coal-fired power and mining industries, and persuaded the federal government finally to extend EI. Where is the money from the federal government to match that? We hear a lot of talk, and there is yet another advisory committee.

We hear pleas from members of the Conservative Party about what the carbon tax is going to do for them. What Canadians are looking for is what is being done to help communities and workers who feel they are suffering directly because of the shift to a clean energy economy.

One-third is going to helping households, businesses, and communities directly. Some $500 million is going to small business tax cuts. Some $1.5 billion is going to low- and middle-income households. There is $1.5 billion in assistance for indigenous communities. It would be nice if the federal government would match that. The effect will be that the average natural gas bill is to rise by approximately $5 a month, and that is before the 2018 rebates. The majority of the gas bill costs remain in delivery, administration, and fixed costs because of the Ralph Klein deregulated system, which the Notley government is also trying to deal with. Two-thirds of Albertans are to receive a rebate.

The projected costs are actually posted on the Alberta website. Any members in this place who are concerned about their constituents can go to the Alberta government website and find out what the carbon tax will be.

As long as Alberta's carbon tax remains in place, we in Alberta will not be subject to the federal tax regime. The government has been very clear on that. Of course, all provinces and territories have the option to implement their own choice of cost regime: cap and trade, carbon tax, or anything else that they can invent.

However, a tax alone will not cut it. Broader federal action is needed if we are to deliver on our Paris commitments. Who said that? Many, including the federal commissioner of the environment and sustainable development, who continues to raise concerns that we are failing to deliver on our commitments in meeting our greenhouse gas reduction targets. Deeper actions are needed, including on climate adaptation. That was in a very recent report by the commissioner. Of course, the government thanked the commissioner for the report, but where is the action?

I have great admiration for the Pembina Institute. The institute and others have said that the political will still appears to be high in the Liberal government. At least they voice support for it, but so is the greenhouse gas inventory high, and it is rising. The government cannot keep adjusting the timelines forward. Now it is saying it cannot possibly meet the 2020 target, so let us try for the 2030 target. The commissioner has spoken out loudly against that. She said that the government has to stop just moving the targets forward and it has to start taking action. Of course, we are already not going to meet the 2020 Copenhagen accord target. Apparently, we are also slated to fail to deliver on our Paris commitments for 2030. That is less than 15 years away. That means we have to be taking a lot of action right now.

Close to 50% of emissions come from two sectors: oil and gas and transportation. We should also take care in the conversion from coal to gas. Burning fossil fuels will remain a health threat. There should be clear timelines for shifting to renewables. I am deeply concerned, and most Canadians are probably not aware that the standards the government is about to impose for a coal plant shifting to gas are not as strict as they are for building a new gas-fired plant. That is unforgivable. That is unforgivable for regions like mine in the Lake Wabamun-Genesee area that is almost the entirety of the supply of electricity in my province. Switching to gas is still going to provide a lot of pollution and we will have a lot of health impacts, and therefore a lot of costs to the public coffers.

The reductions in the building sector have also remained stagnant. We need to move forward on changes to the national building code so that new housing stock is energy efficient. All federal dollars for indigenous housing, schools, and facilities should require energy efficiency standards for sustainability and major cost savings to the communities.

● (1720)

We absolutely need the federal government to deliver the promised dollars to get isolated northern communities off diesel. We can look at the budgets over the last three years that the Liberals have put forward, and I have memorized page 149 and 150 of the 2017-18 budget. All I saw were zeroes for moving reliance of rural and remote communities off diesel: budget 2016-17, zero dollars; 2017-18, zero dollars; and 2018-19, nearly $40 million.

We know how many first nations communities there are, and we know what the costs will be in some of those isolated communities, particularly in the high north. Come on, get with it. Let us move that spending forward.

Supposedly the nation-to-nation relationship is the most important, and we recognize that those communities are struggling. We hear story after story of first nations that are fed up with waiting for government to help them, and they are moving forward themselves with groups like Iron & Earth.

For example, Iron & Earth is partnering with first nations in a community in the Maskwacis in Alberta teaching the local indigenous people how to install solar, and then installing solar. Why are we not doing that right across our country? I do not understand what the delay is.

We talked about skills development in the New Democrats opposition day. In the pan-Canadian program, supposedly for all the jurisdictions to work together to address climate change, what is missing? It is investment in skills development. Even when we put those questions to the government the other day, the answer back is always exactly the same: "Well, we're supporting clean technology". However, who is going to work for the clean technology firms?

There should be massive amounts of money flowing right now into every technical school in Canada. I sat down the other day in my constituency and started listing all the technical schools across this country that deliver renewable energy training. It is unbelievable. It is almost every community college. Certainly the Northern Alberta Institute of Technology in my city has a fantastic program, but it is oversubscribed. Young people are dying to learn these skills. Who is dying to learn it the most? It is our boilermakers, steelworkers, and electricians. They are begging to get into this field. They are saying that they may still work in the fossil fuel industry, but they want to transition over. There is no reason why, when there is a downturn in the oil and gas sector, they could not slide over and work in the renewable sector.

Kudos to Iron & Earth, which started as a small group of men and women who worked in the oil sands. It has now spread right across the country. There is testimony after testimony. I encourage members to go to the Iron & Earth website and look at the testimonials from men and women working in those sectors, and how badly they want to get into this sector.

We heard all the promises from the Conservatives when they were in power. They were in power for 10 years, and they never issued those promised oil and gas regulations. So much for their actions on climate change. They never joined IRENA. Finally, three years later, kudos to the Liberals for finally discovering this international agency for renewable energy and joining it. However, I do not know what they can bring to it. I think they need to start investing and showing that we are actually taking action.

I will close with my former colleague, Paul Dewar, who is kick-starting an initiative next week for youth. I have been working closely with a fabulous group called the 3% Project. Two young people have travelled right across the country visiting just about every high school and every university, including in this city. Their objective of 3% is to reach one million young people in Canada. They want them to learn about the need for action on climate change and sustainability, and to take on a project. It is absolutely inspiring. I encourage everyone to look into 3% Project. That is our future, and I know that they believe we should take action and will not listen to the naysaying from this motion, which we will clearly vote against.

● (1725)

The Deputy Speaker: It being 5:30 p.m., pursuant to an order made on Tuesday, May 29, 2018, and this being the final supply day in the period ending June 23, 2018, it is my duty to interrupt the proceedings and put forthwith every question necessary to dispose of the opposition motion.

[*Translation*]

May I dispense?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

[*Chair read text of motion to the House*]

[*English*]

The Deputy Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Deputy Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And five or more members having risen:

● (1730)

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 81(18), the recorded division stands deferred until later this day.

* * *

MAIN ESTIMATES, 2018-19

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 1—NORTHERN PIPELINE AGENCY

Hon. Scott Brison (President of the Treasury Board, Lib.) moved:

That Vote 1, in the amount of $465,000, under Northern Pipeline Agency — Program expenditures and contributions, in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2019, be concurred in.

He said: Mr. Speaker, tonight, I am pleased to speak about the 2018-19 main estimates, which I tabled on April 16. The main estimates provide information to support the government's request that Parliament approve $276 billion in spending to deliver programs and services in the fiscal year starting April 1, 2018. This includes $113 billion in planned voted expenditures, and $163 billion in statutory expenditures.

The main estimates support two appropriation bills, the first Appropriation Act No. 1, 2018-19, approved $31 billion in interim funding for voted expenditure requirements in the first three months of the fiscal year. The second Appropriation Act No. 2, 2018-19 will approve the remaining $82 billion. Through these main estimates, the government continues to make important investments in the priorities of Canadians: growth, progress, reconciliation, and advancement as part of our plan to grow and strengthen Canada's middle class.

[*Translation*]

We are also delivering on our commitments in a manner that is open, transparent, and accountable to Parliament.

[*English*]

Canadians and the parliamentarians representing them have the right to know how public funds are being spent, and to hold government to account.

[*Translation*]

That is why we made changes to the estimates process to make it easier for Canadians and parliamentarians to track expenditures. For the first time in recent history, the main estimates will include all budget measures announced in this year's budget.

[*English*]

This is a major step forward, and it has been made possible in part by changing the tabling date of the main estimates to mid-April, after the budget. In the past, new initiatives announced in the budget did not appear in the main estimates because the main estimates were tabled before the budget. Parliamentarians were left largely in the dark about how spending announced in the budget would be allocated to departments. *The Globe and Mail* rightly called the system bad to the point of absurdity, with spending estimates usually coming before the budget and in a different accounting format, rendering them virtually meaningless. As the *Globe* put it, "It's a discredited practice that has only served to keep MPs in the dark about how tax dollars are being spent." That is why our government has taken steps to address these problems and strengthen transparency to Parliament.

We have revised the Standing Orders so that the main estimates are much more likely to be tabled after the budget. To do this, we have added the new budget implementation vote to the main estimates. Changing the sequencing allows the 2018-19 main estimates to include all the measures announced in the budget for this year. Therefore, today, parliamentarians have a document in front of them that is relevant and complete so they are better able to hold government to account for how it spends tax dollars. By law, this money can only be spent on the measures announced in the budget tabled on February 27, 2018. Treasury Board, as a central agency, does not have any discretion to use the funds for any other purpose. Parliamentarians can now trace each and every allocation from this new central vote to a specific line in the budget. That is table A2.11 in the budget, and in the main estimates in annex 1.

Allow me to address some of the concerns that have been raised recently about the budget implementation vote. Let us take the assertion that the budget implementation vote does not allow sufficient oversight by parliamentarians. As someone who has served in this House for over 21 years, I respectfully disagree. In fact, parliamentarians still have the opportunity to study and vote on the budget and the estimates and the appropriation bills for the main and supplementary estimates. In both the budget plan and the main estimates, they have a detailed disclosure of the measures to be funded from the central vote. Former parliamentary budget officer, Kevin Page, recently called the detailed table in the 2018 budget, "a 'clear signal' that the federal government wants and is working to give a more accurate figure of the year's upcoming spending".

• (1735)

Parliamentarians will also be able to see allocations to departments and remaining balances for the line-by-line budget measures in monthly reports online and in the next available estimates.

I would add that former Department of Finance officials and economists, Scott Clark and Peter DeVries, gave budget 2018 an A grade for fiscal credibility, writing:

> With respect to transparency the 2018 budget provides more detailed financial analysis and information than any budget that we can remember, and we go back a long way. For critics of the budget who felt such information was lacking, they should perhaps take the time to read the Annexes.

Let me now turn to the suggestion that the constraints placed around the use of the funds in the budget implementation vote are not sufficiently binding. This is completely untrue.

Annex 1 of the main estimates details, line by line, the limitations of the vote. It includes specific measures, departments, and maximum funding available for budget 2018 through the central vote. In addition, as I mentioned, on page 261 of the TBS main estimates, we reiterate these details.

Treasury Board cannot allocate additional funds or otherwise reallocate funding from other initiatives to support these programs.

Let us say, for example, that circumstances change, and the government proposes increasing funding for a budget measure identified in the budget implementation vote. The result would be that a separate funding decision would be required. Parliament would then be asked to approve the items separately in future estimates. I will provide an example.

Budget 2018 proposes a number of important investments, including $154 million to the Department of Health to address the opioid crisis. These funds are reflected in the 2018-19 main estimates budget implementation vote. Let us say that over the course of the year the opioid crisis worsened and the government decided it needed to invest more. If the government wanted to increase funding for this, or for any other budget measure identified in the budget implementation vote for that matter, a separate funding decision would be required and Parliament would be asked to approve the items separately in future estimates.

I spoke with the Parliamentary Budget Officer about the idea of amending the wording of the vote to create even more clarity and provide him and Parliament with even greater assurance. I am pleased to report that based on that conversation, we have amended the vote wording in the appropriation bill to incorporate by reference the details in annex 1 of the main estimates.

I invite members to turn to page 29 of the supply bill, which states, "Authority granted to the Treasury Board to supplement any appropriation of a department or other organization set out in Annex 1 to the Main Estimates for the fiscal year, for an initiative announced in the Budget of February 27, 2018, and set out under that department or other organizations name in that Annex, in an amount that does not exceed the amount set out opposite that initiative in the Annex."

With this amendment, it is even clearer that funding may only be provided for the measures, amounts, and organizations detailed line by line in annex 1 of the main estimates.

It is also worth noting that Auditor General Michael Ferguson has said "he's less concerned by the $7-billion vote because...the government is bound to the line-by-line promises." He said, "You have to allocate it", funding for the budget measures, "on that basis, you can't just decide somebody else should get more and somebody else can get less. To me that's not the authority that they've been given by Parliament." We wholeheartedly agree with the Auditor General.

Finally, I would like to address the view that the initiatives to be funded through this vote are not reflected in the departmental plans, that there remains a lack of alignment between the budget initiatives and the planned results. Allow me to clarify that alignment between the main estimates and departmental plans has not changed. Instead, we have actually improved transparency by including budget 2018 funding in a central vote managed by the Treasury Board Secretariat.

● (1740)

As the year progresses, parliamentarians will be able to better track budget allocations because they will be reported in the monthly online reports; the next available supplementary estimates; the departmental results report, after the fiscal year has ended; and through a budget implementation tracker on the GC infobase. This is a level of transparency not available in previous estimates that parliamentarians have been debating and voting on for years.

[*Translation*]

I would now like to talk about budget 2018 and highlight some of the measures our government is taking for the middle class. Canadians want to ensure that more and more people benefit from a growing economy.

[*English*]

That includes Canada's talented, ambitious, and hard-working women. By supporting women entrepreneurs, reducing the gender wage gap, and increasing the participation of women in the labour force, we are helping boost economic growth for all Canadians.

Budget 2018 also aims to close the gap between the living conditions of indigenous peoples and non-indigenous peoples, facilitate self-determination, and advance recognition of rights.

As of today, 63 long-term drinking water advisories on reserves have been lifted, but there is still much more work to be done. Our government is committed to ending long-term drinking water advisories on public water systems on reserves by March 2021, and we are making greater investments through budget 2018 to try to beat that deadline.

To help address employment gaps between indigenous and non-indigenous populations, we are investing $2 billion over five years to create a new indigenous skills and employment training program.

[*Translation*]

Budget 2018 also creates new opportunities for innovators since its invests nearly $4 billion over five years to support the next generation of Canadian researchers. This is the most significant investment ever made in basic research in Canada.

[*English*]

Through these estimates, we are investing in the priorities of Canadians. We are creating economic growth for the middle class and those working hard to join it. In addition, we are making important changes that will improve the clarity, transparency, and accountability of government spending. In doing so, we are continuing to raise the bar on openness and transparency to Parliament and Canadians.

Mr. Kelly McCauley (Edmonton West, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I would like to quote the past PBO on the use of the estimates for a slush fund. Kevin Page said, "There's no way it's an improvement." He likes to cherry pick a couple of comments from the past PBO, but this is what he actually said of the vote 40 slush fund, that there was no way it was an improvement. He continues, "The irony is they're asking Parliament to write a cheque, to provide these authorities, when the executive has not scrutinized the measures."

The current PBO, whom the Treasury Board president seems to think is in agreement with him, said that because not one penny of the slush fund was in the departmental plans, the Treasury Board president had not aligned the estimates and the budget.

Seeing that the whole point of this was to align the estimates with the budget, which the PBO has said is clearly not done, could the President of the Treasury Board tell us why he is taking away the scrutiny and the power of Parliament when he has not accomplished what he tried to set out to do?

● (1745)

Hon. Scott Brison: Mr. Speaker, I would draw the attention of the hon. member to the words of the Auditor General, who did recognize that our government could not move funding arbitrarily from one of these commitment to another, one of these investments that are listed quite clearly in annex 1 of the main estimates and referred to in the supply bill, without coming back to Parliament.

It is a little rich, coming from the Conservatives, to talk about openness and transparency to Parliament or respect for the Parliamentary Budget Officer. In the last Parliament, the PBO had to take the Harper Conservatives to court to get information on government spending. Furthermore, the Harper Conservative government was the only government in the history of the British Commonwealth to have been found to be in contempt of Parliament by Mr. Speaker Milliken for not providing the information required by Parliament to do our work.

Mr. Daniel Blaikie (Elmwood—Transcona, NDP): Mr. Speaker, one of the important aspects of accountability is the challenge function. That is true for Parliament. Part of our job in opposition is to challenge the government on its planned spending.

One of the problems with Treasury Board vote 40 is that when departmental officials are called before committees to answer questions about what they plan to do with the money, in a number of cases they tell us flat out that they have not planned what to do with the money. They have a basic idea, high level, but as to how they will deliver on that high level, the work will not be done until the money is approved.

That makes it hard for Parliament to do its job of holding the government to account when the government itself says that it does not have any plans for which we can hold it to account. Is that a model of accountability that the President of the Treasury Board would accept?

If department officials went to Treasury Board, asked for funds, told officials not to worry because they would post online monthly reports with respect to what they did with the funds, and they could be held to account after the fact, does the minister think that is an acceptable model for accountability in Treasury Board?

Hon. Scott Brison: Mr. Speaker, Treasury Board is not only acting more rigorously than under the previous government, but is acting more transparently.

I suspect the hon. member is familiar with the search engine Google. If he were to google Treasury Board Canada budget implementation vote 2018, he will see monthly updates on how much of the funding has been allocated and how much remains. If he wants to go further to understand the activities of departments and really follow the money, he could use that search engine, Google, and google departmental results framework with the name of a department. He will not only see greater information and clarity on the activities of the department, but he will see, for the first time ever, that our government is reporting on results of investments. We are not just focused on outputs, on how much we are spending, but we are focused on outcomes, what we are achieving.

Further, if he would like to google Treasury Board Canada departmental plans, he can review the annual plans for each department.

I have great respect for the hon. member and I have great respect for—

The Deputy Speaker: Order, please. Perhaps the hon. President of the Treasury Board could elaborate on that point in the next iteration.

The hon. member for Rivière-des-Mille-Îles.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Linda Lapointe (Rivière-des-Mille-Îles, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, listening to my colleague talk about the budget was a delight.

My riding is north of Montreal. It is a prosperous suburb with many small and medium-sized businesses, including some in the aerospace sector, and a lot of export activity. I am also fortunate to be a member of the Standing Committee on International Trade, which studied a number of free trade agreements, including the Canada-European Union Comprehensive Economic and Trade Agreement, CETA, and the comprehensive and progressive agreement for trans-Pacific partnership, the CPTPP. The latter will be implemented under Bill C-79, which was introduced today.

I would like to know how this will help the middle class in my riding and the rest of Canada. Will it help grow the middle class by opening up opportunities for female entrepreneurs in our ridings? I would like my colleague to talk about the opportunities these agreements and the budget will create.

● (1750)

Hon. Scott Brison: Mr. Speaker, I really appreciate the question.

Let me start off by saying that it is patently obvious we have to diversify our international trade relationships. That is why our Minister of International Trade, our Prime Minister, and our whole team are working very hard to sign free trade agreements such as the CPTPP and CETA.

Diversifying our relationships is of vital importance. We need to make sure that our businesses, be they large or small, have the means to increase prosperity and create middle-class jobs. That is an important part of our plan.

It is also crucial that we enhance economic opportunities available to women across Canada, and our commitment to that is clear in the latest budget.

[*English*]

Mr. Kelly McCauley (Edmonton West, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I would like to continue about the transparency, or lack thereof, of vote 40. When we had the Minister of Public Services and Procurement at committee to discuss the $650 million, almost two-thirds of a billion dollars, in vote 40 and what it was for, she was not able to answer. She referred it to her assistant deputy minister and senior CFO.

There was $300 million for Phoenix. We asked him specifically what it was for. He was not able to answer. He told us it was preposterous to expect parliamentarians and taxpayers to know what the money was being planned for and what the planned results were before we approved it.

I am wondering if the President of the Treasury Board believes it is preposterous that parliamentarians and taxpayers should know what the plans are and what makes up this money before we approve it.

Hon. Scott Brison: Mr. Speaker, I believe the hon. member's question was specifically on Public Services and Procurement Canada.

To go through that, the investments will be $307 million, through the 2018-19 main estimates, for PSPC to stabilize the government's pay system. That is a mess we inherited from the Harper Conservatives, who, in cutting $70 million from the budget at that time, eliminated 700 pay advisers and created the genesis of the situation we have now.

Also, $275 million will be invested to maintain and repair real property. The Government of Canada, through Public Services and Procurement Canada, manages about seven million square metres of office space. Of that, 3.5 million square meters are owned, and 3.5 million are leased. That will help repair real property. There are a lot of deferred maintenance issues in our real property portfolio that simply need to be addressed.

It will also include $52 million to be invested to find a simpler and better procurement solution. We know the importance of using modern tools and digital technology to improve the relationship between the Government of Canada and the people we serve. That includes the vendor community, which is why we are investing to make it easier to do business with the Government of Canada, grow their businesses, and provide great services for the people.

The Deputy Speaker: That will conclude the period of time for questions and comments. I have taken note of the interest of hon. members in participating in questions and comments and will make sure we can fit you in during subsequent rounds.

Resuming debate, the hon. member for Louis-Saint-Laurent.

● (1755)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gérard Deltell (Louis-Saint-Laurent, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I will be sharing my time with the member for Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo.

[*English*]

One of the most important principles we have as elected members of Parliament is what we call the responsibility of government.

[*Translation*]

This means that when a government tables a budget or potential expenditure, it will be analyzed by the elected representatives of the people. This is one of the founding principles, a pillar of our system, and we must maintain and support it. We certainly must not ignore it, which is why we are here today talking about the latest main estimates tabled by the President of the Treasury Board for the upcoming year.

There is one thing in particular in these main estimates that members of the official opposition and members of the second opposition group are worried about, namely the infamous vote 40.

This vote would give the government access to a $7.4-billion envelope to spend according to its priorities, and it would not have to report on this envelope until the fall of 2019. I remind members that there will be an election in the fall of 2019. The government is essentially getting a blank cheque so big that it is almost grotesque, but that is the truth. The government is getting $7.4 billion, and it can do whatever it wants with it. Life is good, and we will talk about it after the election.

This is not how things work in our democratic system. It is important and imperative that every dollar spent be subject to scrutiny.

If by some misfortune this vote is approved and we accept this situation, that is more than $7 billion that will be sheltered from the scrutiny that we are all subject to in accordance with our mandate. The sad thing is that the programs are vague and it is even written that way in the legislation. The money can be associated with departments or agencies, but the legislation does not specify where the money will go, how it will be spent, and what their objectives are. It is worrisome.

There are also no progress reports. Usually we would get a report every three to four months. That makes sense because it allows us to know how far we have come, are we on course? Are we following the curve? Is the spending in line with what was projected or are we spending too much? It is important to have an update every three or four months, depending on the expenses. In this case, reports are not required. That is another concern.

There is also no legal controls around the use of this fund, which should be a top priority. It is very important. When we vote on budgets, on envelopes, we have some idea of what is in store. Sometimes there are some contingencies, which is totally legitimate, but we know where we can spend and where we cannot. That is what we call legal controls. None exist in the case of vote 40. We believe that is a concern that absolutely must be addressed.

The same goes for the budget. There are things in this budget that are vague and lack legal restraints. Everything is left to the goodwill of the government. It can spend as it sees fit with the margin of manoeuvre that it gave itself.

● (1800)

I am sure that, later on, my colleagues across the way will very keenly claim that I do not know my history and that I should know that my own government, meaning the previous government, did the same thing with a $3-billion budget.

Given that Canada and the entire world were in the midst of the worst economic crisis since the great recession, it was perfectly normal for the government to give itself three billion dollars' worth of latitude. I would point out that that is less than half of the amount currently at issue, and back then, the economic climate called for swift, immediate action.

Everyone knows that the situation is reversed today, because the economy is booming around the world, not just in Canada. That means our economy is flourishing and jobs are being created, all thanks to the global economic boom. We need to keep that in mind.

Naturally, as soon as the subject of public finances or budgets comes up, since that is what we are talking about, I feel impelled to remind the members that the government betrayed the trust Canadians had placed in it. Almost three years ago now, these people got elected on the promise of small deficits and a zero deficit in 2019.

How is that actually playing out? The deficit is three times higher than promised, and we have no idea when the budget will be balanced. Then the Liberals have the gall to ask us to trust them when they say the $7.4 billion will be put to good use. We want to believe them, we know they are not dishonest folks, but the problem is that they said one thing to get elected and are now doing the opposite. The problem is that voters believed they could trust them. Unfortunately, they were wrong. The Liberals have not kept their promises. They have scrapped the agenda they campaigned on. Day after day, they talked about how they were bold enough, courageous enough, but also responsible enough to say that deficits were necessary to stimulate the economy and that everything would be fine. Great. Wonderful.

Today we see the truth of it. The Liberals have run up massive deficits and have no idea when they will balance the budget. That flies in the face of every single recognized, rigorous economic theory. Just because a country is enjoying a period of prosperity does not mean it should go into debt. We all know about economic cycles. Sooner or later, when prosperity is flagging, the government will have to pay for today's spending with money it does not have.

The government likes to crow about its lofty principles, saying how fantastic it is that it has lifted thousands of children out of poverty with more generous benefits than the previous government offered. It is so easy to hand out money one does not have and, I would add, so low to claim to be doing it for the children, when they are the ones who are going to pay for it later.

A deficit is a debt. When is a debt paid? Later. A debt is a bill that our children and grandchildren will be forced to pay because today's Liberal government does not know how to manage money responsibly. It certainly cannot manage it properly with the mandate it was given, which was specifically to run a small deficit.

[*English*]

Just to be clear, what the government is saying to us right now is, "Send us $7.4 billion. We know what is good, and people will see it a year and a half from now, because all the results will be in the fall of 2019." What a coincidence. It will be just after what? It will be after the election. Who will have to get all the problems from that? For sure, the official opposition, which we are today, will be in office two years from now.

Mr. Lloyd Longfield (Guelph, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I always enjoy the hon. member's financial interventions. I like finance. I come from a business background.

One thing I noticed when I became a member of Parliament was that budgets and estimates did not align with each other. They were in different periods. They were in different years. It was confusing to see what we were budgeting and what we were actually spending and how we compared the two. Now when we go on Canada.ca, it is all in the same period. We can see last year's expenditures, this year's estimates voted on, next year's estimates, and estimates to date. Therefore, we now have full transparency between budgets and estimates, bringing them into the same period.

The $7 billion that was on the floor has to do with coming into the same period. Would the hon. member comment on how helpful or hurtful it has been for us to now have budgets and estimates in the same period?

● (1805)

Mr. Gérard Deltell: Mr. Speaker, if it is so good, why do we have to wait until October 2019 to have the real results of what we are debating today? We are talking about $7.4 billion. When will we know exactly how that money will be spent? It will be a year and a half from now.

I was very interested in the comments of my colleague. He said he is very interested in finance and all of that. I am sure he has read what he was elected for. I have the platform of the Liberal Party. When the Liberals were talking about finance, they said they would produce small deficits for three years and get back to a zero deficit in 2019. They were elected on that. Where are the results?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Daniel Blaikie (Elmwood—Transcona, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for his speech.

When it comes to managing public funds, Canadians must be able to trust the members of the government, but we also need to have processes in place that are so transparent that Canadians and parliamentarians are left with no doubt that funds are being managed appropriately.

One of the problems with vote 40 for the Treasury Board Secretariat is that the government does not want to provide any information until after the funds have been spent.

Is it right to approve and allow spending without providing any information about it, or is is not important to have that information before approving it?

Mr. Gérard Deltell: Mr. Speaker, I would like to start by commending, thanking, and congratulating the member for the quality of his French. It is really remarkable and impressive. I see that my colleague from Berthier—Maskinongé is nodding because she shares the same vision and has said the same thing. Let us be proud of all the members who speak admirably in French and English, which is appreciated. I will also commend the President of the Treasury Board, who answered some questions in excellent French.

Now, the issue raised by my colleague from British Columbia and a member of the second opposition party is quite pertinent and goes to the heart of today's debate. When we have to vote on a budget, we need to know the exact amounts that will be spent and where, how, and when they will be spent. Furthermore, the results should be reported on a regular basis.

In this instance, for the $7.4 billion, that is not happening. We are not even close to having ministerial responsibility. That is why we are very concerned and believe that the government should fix this situation, tell Canadians the truth, and not wait until after the election to disclose how it spent this money.

Hon. Scott Brison (President of the Treasury Board, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to help my colleague with his research. If he would like information about how each amount is spent, he can consult the website or use Google. All he has to do is search for the following phrase:

[*English*]

"Treasury Board Canada budget implementation vote 2018", and as such, he will have monthly updates on how the funding has been allocated and how much is remaining. In fact, he does not have to wait until the fall of 2019, although I suspect that after the election, in the fall of 2019, he will continue to have a fair bit of time on his hands to do this kind of research from one of those seats over there. However, I appreciate very much his optimism and professionalism in this House.

Mr. Gérard Deltell: Mr. Speaker, because I have just a few seconds, I want to thank my hon. colleague for his comments and the quality of his French.

As far as we are concerned, the $7.4 billion is not well developed, and we are not aware of what the government will do.

If I may say this to my estimates colleague, he should be careful when he talks about Google. I think the government is a bit too involved with that.

● (1810)

Mrs. Cathy McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to speak this evening to the main estimates, and of course, the important vote tonight. I think this is one of the most important debates we have in this House. We are talking about spending a lot of Canadians' hard-earned tax dollars.

There are many good things the federal government can do for Canadians, but we need to be very particular about how we authorize and how we look at the government's plans for spending money, because every penny has come from citizens who work hard. When they give money to the government, it means that it is perhaps a hockey lesson their child cannot do. It is something they are foregoing with that money going to the government. I think as we have this debate tonight, that should be very clear.

Perhaps, by the end of the points I make, anyone who might be watching this debate is going to realize that the government is betraying its commitment to transparency and accountability. I am going to give a few examples of how that has happened. They have taken what was an imperfect system and made it a whole lot worse than it was.

First of all, I want to talk a little bit about the normal process at committee and how the government has degraded that normal process that used to happen, and then I will talk about the infamous vote 40.

It used to be that for the main estimates, the minister would come to committee. We would usually have an hour with the minister and an hour with the officials to talk to them about their spending and their spending plans. I am going to use the indigenous affairs portfolio as an example.

Indigenous and Northern Affairs Canada, as members know, has been split into two parts. What happened this year was that the government decided it would have one minister for one hour and the other minister for the other hour. It was quite interesting. We would have liked to have that televised, because it was important. We heard that there were ministers at many committees. There were four committees that had ministers for a two-hour session on that particular day.

What happened was that there were votes, so in our first hour, we actually had 30 minutes of time to talk to the minister and her departmental officials, and then there was another vote, and we only had 30 minutes for the second minister. What that meant, in reality, was that once the minister had given her 10-minute presentation, the official opposition had a grand total of seven minutes to question the minister on her spending plans. We had seven minutes for the Minister of Crown-Indigenous Relations and seven minutes for the Minister of Indigenous Services.

What does that mean? We had seven minutes to talk to the minister about Indigenous and Northern Affairs Canada, which has not been separated yet. We had seven minutes to talk about $3 billion for the Minister of Crown-Indigenous Relations, and seven minutes to talk to the Minister of Indigenous Services about $9.3 billion.

How can the official opposition do an effective job when the government does not even have the courtesy of looking at what is happening and planning its votes and its need for adjournment and stopping debate? The Liberals plan them for times when they know that committees are meeting and ministers are there. They are eroding accountability. That is a significant concern, because to be quite frank, seven minutes is absolutely nothing for spending of almost $10 billion.

Of course, that does not include talking about the $1 billon that is in this very elusive vote 40. The President of the Treasury Board has stated that he is going to align the budget so that we have more information.

Let me tell colleagues what people have said about vote 40. We had seven minutes to talk about $9 billion. We had seven minutes to ask questions of the minister about $3 billion, and we really do not know what is happening with that $1 billion. The member is trying to proclaim that this is better for Parliament and good news to know that we are going to authorize spending.

● (1815)

Let me get into what a few people have said.

As an article written in *The Hill Times* reported, "If the $7-billion central vote passes with the main estimates on Thursday, former PBO Kevin Page says it represents 'a new low' for Parliament's financial oversight system."

We have already talked about having a challenge in terms of proper oversight, and now we have a new system that further erodes that. I would like to give credit to the member for Elmwood—Transcona. He said, "something irregular and abnormal [is] happening here in terms of the way the government is asking to approve spending". That is pretty significant.

I will go back to the former parliamentary budget officer, because the Liberals certainly liked him in the past. In the last Parliament, they talked about the important work he did.

Mr. Speaker, you made a ruling on whether there was a legitimate process for the $7-billion slush fund.

The article continues that former parliamentary budget officer said by email that he respectfully disagreed with the ruling:

> "Not all central funds are the same," he said, noting the government proposes that this central fund asks Parliament to approve "new appropriations" in the latest budget. "This is a very bad precedent for Parliament."
>
> "Financial control and ministerial accountability are being undermined. This is a new low for our appropriation system," he said.
>
> "How can the Parliament hold the President of the Treasury Board...responsible and accountable for all authorities requested in the latest budget?" he asked, for money allocated for Indigenous people, veterans, and more.
>
> Despite a 2015 campaign promise of estimates reform, Mr. Page said we are left with "the false pretence of reconciliation at great cost to accountability."

I listened very carefully to the speech from the President of the Treasury Board, and he certainly cherry-picked positive comments.

The article continues,

> ...a Parliamentary Budget Office report last month suggested the approach is "somewhat novel," because it asks Parliament to provide funding before it goes through the Treasury Board submission process, which scrutinizes intended... spending.

I was not there, but I understand that during a meeting of the government operations and estimates committee, which is tasked with some of this important work, the Liberals walked out. They would not participate in the debate. This is what they chose to do instead of talking about the new system and the estimates. In the time I have been in Parliament, I have never seen that from the representatives of the government on a committee. The Liberal members on that committee walked out. They did not come back to committee, and then, of course, the estimates were deemed considered. If this is the government's commitment to transparency, accountability, and dialogue, it is really quite shameful.

We have heard significant concerns. I could go on with quote after quote. As the article said, a Conservative senator from Newfoundland and Labrador in that other place "accused the government of promising an Australian model but offering nothing like it". She said, "I feel like we've been led down the garden path".

We have a system that has always been a challenge. The are significant dollars. These are important dollars. These are taxpayers' dollars. The government is spending a lot of taxpayers' dollars, and it is eroding the system and doing the exact opposite of increasing accountability and transparency. Tonight we should stand up and make that point very clearly.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Greg Fergus (Hull—Aylmer, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am certain members are familiar with the well-known saying that a person is known by the company they keep.

I would like to know if my hon. colleague agrees with Ian Brodie, ex-chief of staff to former prime minister Stephen Harper, who said that he welcomed these changes and believed they were on the right track.

● (1820)

[*English*]

Mrs. Cathy McLeod: Mr. Speaker, I find it ironic that the Liberals, who so appreciated both the former PBO and the current PBO in the last Parliament, did not listen to what they said. To be quite frank, the Parliamentary Budget Officer is intimately knowledgeable about the machinations of government, and especially Treasury Board. Therefore, I certainly would view their comments with a great deal of alarm. Again, both the current PBO and the past PBO raised a red flag, and the Liberals should be listening to that red flag.

Mr. Daniel Blaikie (Elmwood—Transcona, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I thank my hon. colleague for having put some of the remarks of Kevin Page from a recent *Hill Times* article on the record. I think he has a lot of credibility. He was cited as an authority by the President of the Treasury Board, and I think his remarks with respect to overturning an important principle of parliamentary accountability are quite true, and I am so glad to have them on the record.

I wonder if the member wanted to elaborate a bit more on what it means to try and hold a government to account, and whether it makes sense, on that notion of accountability, that we could do that if we do not have the information as to how the government is planning to spend the money until after the money is already spent, and what that means in terms of the idea of holding people to account.

Mrs. Cathy McLeod: Mr. Speaker, I think the member for Elmwood—Transcona speaks to the issue perfectly. It already is a challenge for the opposition to hold government to account. When the government creates these sorts of changes where we do not even have a proper and due process, it is even more critical.

I want to highlight the recent Auditor General's comments, where he said that the government seems to be measuring its success by the dollars it spends. One of the opportunities that we have when we bring ministers to committee is to say, "You say you are going to spend $7 billion. Can you talk about how that program is making a difference?" When the Liberals erode that down to seven minutes, because they want to violate our opportunities for debate in this House by bringing closure on bills or adjournments, it not only creates challenges but compounds the challenges.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Linda Lapointe (Rivière-des-Mille-Îles, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have been listening closely to my colleagues for some time now. I would have liked to ask my colleague from Louis-Saint-Laurent a question when he spoke earlier, but I will instead ask my hon. colleague from Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo.

This evening, we will have debates, followed by votes. These votes will be on matters such as public transportation and the Canada Infrastructure Bank, with its more than $180-billion infrastructure plan. I get the impression that my colleagues will be voting against this measure.

How will my colleague from Louis-Saint-Laurent explain his decision to deny funding to the Quebec City tramway and to public transportation? I would like to hear the member's thoughts on this.

[*English*]

Mrs. Cathy McLeod: Mr. Speaker, what we will be voting against is the creation of a process that has allowed for such limited scrutiny. The Liberals will be asking us to vote for a slush fund that is worth over $7 billion tonight. How can we, as parliamentarians, and the backbenchers as well, vote in good conscience for something that we know there are no proper checks and balances around? I would suggest that maybe some of the Liberal backbenchers should look at these issues and perhaps think very carefully about what they are voting for.

Mr. Daniel Blaikie (Elmwood—Transcona, NDP): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to finally rise to address the issue of these main estimates. This debate on the main estimates is very different than we have in the past because there is a new mechanism for how the government is seeking to appropriate all of the money that it says it requires for its new budget initiatives. As members in this place will know, I have tried, in a number of ways, to have a debate in the House on this, so I very pleased that we are finally getting an opportunity, if only briefly, to discuss this.

I made a request of the President of the Treasury Board to have a take-note debate on this, I made a request of you, Mr. Speaker, that we have an emergency debate on this, I raised it in a number of different ways at committee, and, yes, I have been frustrated. There was some allusion made already to what debate at committee looked like. There was one meeting where the committee adjourned with 40 minutes left on the clock in our scheduled time because government members saw fit to adjourn the committee rather than stick around to do our duty and study the main estimates. On another occasion, Liberals left the meeting en masse so there was no quorum and the meeting collapsed. The chair made arrangements for us to go back and continue the study of the estimates, but when the time came to resume that study, all six Liberal members did not show up and the meeting could not continue.

Although the estimates on Treasury Board have been reported back to the House, it is important to note that they were deemed reported back and not, in fact, approved by the committee. While I know that from a procedural point of view that makes no difference in the House, from a moral point of view, it makes an important difference, because the fact of the matter is that the new mechanism was not approved by the committee but simply deemed approved. Therefore, it is important that we now address that issue.

I will direct some of my remarks directly to what the President of the Treasury Board said tonight in this debate. He talked about the fact that the estimates process has not been a perfect process. I do not think any members here would disagree. We know that it was dysfunctional to have estimates tabled only days after the budget was presented in the House and to not have any new budget initiatives reflected in the estimates. That is why New Democrats, as a party, were quite open to the idea that we would delay the tabling of the main estimates on a trial basis in order to give the government more time to do its due diligence and move new budget initiatives through the Treasury Board process so that the rigorous costing was done, so that the program planning was done, and so that government would be able to answer questions about how it proposes to spend the money allocated for new budget initiatives.

In fact, that is not what happened. Instead, the government decided to create a new central vote, heretofore unprecedented, and dump all of the proposed spending into the one vote. That had a number of important consequences for the study of the estimates. For one, it kind of broke the committee study process, because instead of having those new budget initiatives that under the old system would have, in time, gone to the subject expert committees, all of those things went to one committee, the Standing Committee on Government Operations and Estimates, which is not an expert on the environment, health, or defence, and yet it was being asked to evaluate the new spending proposals in the government's budget. Therefore, that was not particularly good from a study point of view.

It also undermined the process because we were being referred to a document, namely, the budget, which is outside the usual estimates process, in order to get information about that spending. However, the budget document is, by its nature, vague and the vagueness of the budget may be frustrating from time to time, but it is not inappropriate. It is a policy document in which the government lays out its high-level goals and throws some figures in. They are not the real figures or the end figures, those come in the estimates, but that is why there are two different processes. The government has been kind of conflating those processes and, in the end, diluting the importance and accuracy of the estimates. Therefore, there was a problem in the way these estimates were going to be studied, but also in terms of referring us to less detailed documents.

● (1825)

We saw, time and time again, with department officials who came to committee, that they do not have a plan. We even saw some of them were just genuinely confused. They did not understand how this new system worked and how it was they were supposed to be getting money that was not reflected in their main departmental estimates. That confusion was apparent at committee when the Liberals, as a kind of Hail Mary pass, decided to have an omnibus study meeting on the last day before the estimates would be deemed back to the House, where they invited officials from a dozen different departments to present within an hour or so.

Earlier, an honourable member talked about how frustrating it is to only get seven minutes with a minister on the entire department. Well, imagine getting 14 minutes with 12 departments. Do the math on that and it is about a minute per department for all of the new budget spending. That is only because not all the departments were even represented. I do not think that meeting met the threshold of rigorous scrutiny that people would expect.

There have been a number of procedural problems because this vote does not fit our normal processes, and so parliamentarians have been trying to work that out as best they can at committee. Of course, the real solution would be not to have a vote like this at all.

I started by saying that we were in a position where there was a problem with the process. We were open to the idea of allowing a later tabling of the estimates so the government could do the rigorous costing and get it through Treasury Board so officials could actually answer questions about what the proposed spending was. Instead, what we were given was a mechanism where there is a nice table that aligns with what is in the budget, but we cannot actually do our work as parliamentarians to hold the government to account and see if it has a decent plan for how it is going to spend that money.

This is where I want to get to some of the remarks of the President of the Treasury Board, because I think that by an intellectual sleight of hand he is missing the point. The point was never just to have the kind of soft budgeting numbers from the budget document reflected in the estimates. The idea was that we would get the harder, more rigorous numbers developed through the Treasury Board process in the estimates for the new budget initiative so parliamentarians could actually do their due diligence in the main estimates that represented the budget.

Instead, we have been asked to trade off information that aligns better between the two documents against our actual powers of oversight and accountability with government. That is not just my analysis, that is what the Parliamentary Budget Officer said with respect to the budget implementation vote as well. It was very clear there was a trade-off here, and on the other side of that trade-off was a sacrifice of parliamentary accountability.

What we have heard consistently from the minister and his officials at committee is that somehow parliamentarians are supposed to be satisfied that they can hold the government to account and perform their oversight function if they get the information after the money is spent. They somehow think accountability works by giving a blanket approval to, in this case, over $7 billion worth of funding, and then getting a note posted online after about how the government spent the money. If that money is not well spent, the fact is there is no way to take it back. Canadians do not get that money back. That is why they send us here to do our due diligence and make sure the government has a realistic plan before authority is given for that spending.

That is the important principle being undermined here, and one that has not been addressed in the arguments of the President of the Treasury Board. I wish he would explain how it is he thinks that is an acceptable model. That was the basis of the question I posed to him earlier this evening that he did not answer. I do not see how he could accept this notion of retroactive accountability as the basis for the Treasury Board's own work.

The Treasury Board has an important accountability function within government. Its job is to challenge departments and make sure that their business plan, or whatever we want to call it, or their strategic plan for new government initiatives make sense, that they have done their due diligence, have done appropriate costing, and have considered different ways of running a program. I find it very hard to believe that the President of the Treasury Board would find it acceptable if departments came to the Treasury Board and said that instead of having it ask them all these obnoxious questions, because they are not really sure what they are going to do yet, to stop badgering them if they agree with the goals about how they are going to get it done.

● (1830)

Suppose department officials could say they were going to go away and figure it out, and that the President of the Treasury Board did not have to tell them how to do it, because they knew how to do their job. When they were finished and had signed the contracts and paid the money, then they would post online what they did, and the officials at Treasury Board could look it up. If they did not like it they could call the departments and talk about it, and that would be Treasury Board holding them to account.

It is laughable. I certainly hope Treasury Board would not accept that model for itself. The idea that Treasury Board officials think that parliamentarians should accept that notion of accountability for Parliament and that Parliament should understand its accountability function for government in that way is an insult to this place. It makes perfect sense that parliamentarians would be able to ask questions of government departments in terms of what they are going to do with money.

As an example, in these estimates there is approximately $54 million under Treasury Board vote 40, or the budget implementation vote, for the Canada Border Services Agency, to strengthen the border and to help the CBSA. There are a lot of ways. We have had debates in this House about the border. Different people have different ideas about what ought to be done on the border. They cannot tell me it does not matter to parliamentarians whether the government ultimately uses that money to hire more CBSA staff, to buy guns, or to build a wall. Those are three ways to strengthen the border on some interpretations. Obviously, some are better than others.

The idea that it would not matter to parliamentarians which of those three roads the government was planning to take is ridiculous. However, we have heard from Treasury Board officials at committee that it is not the business of parliamentarians to plan programs and to wonder how the money exactly is going to be spent, that parliamentarians should be satisfied with high-level—read "vacuous"—goal statements like "Strengthening the Canada Border Services Agency". We cannot approve money on that basis alone and Parliament has already recognized that.

That is why we have had a rigorous process, not a perfect process by any means but a process that at least in principle allowed parliamentarians to interrogate ministers about the plans for the departments and particular line items in the budget to know how they were planning to spend that money. That is not some cute principle. It is essential in order for parliamentarians to be able to do their jobs. I have found it astonishing that the Treasury Board, who recognizes that in its own work, and ought to, does not see that Parliament requires information as well, in order to be able to be said to be an accountable body.

There is a need for accountability. That is something certainly that the Liberals recognized in the last campaign.

Let us take a recent example of the Phoenix pay system where the Auditor General has called it an "incomprehensible failure", because at various stages in the process people were not asking the right questions, or they were accepting answers that needed to be challenged and those answers were not being challenged. The fact of the matter is that for an organization as large as the Government of Canada, if it is going to have proper accountability for spending, it needs to have multiple accountability mechanisms.

Parliament is one of the most important and fundamental of those mechanisms. Therefore, it is wrong for us to be undermining the power of Parliament to provide effective oversight for government spending. I am not saying that the estimates process alone would have stopped Phoenix. Obviously money for Phoenix was appropriated under the estimates process. However, it is one of those important checks and balances, and if we allow each of those checks and balances to be undermined because no one check and balance is the be-all and end-all, eventually we are going to find ourselves in a situation where we do not have an appropriate number of checks and balances.

As I say, Parliament is one of the most important because it is the accountability process that gives the political and moral legitimacy for government to pursue certain measures. It is not a simple control. It is actually one of the most important controls because it is the one that confers legitimacy to government programs.

That is, in essence, the real problem with Treasury Board vote 40, or the budget implementation vote. It does not allow Parliament to do its job.

● (1835)

Getting more information is good. I do not think anybody here is opposed to the idea of having more information, or having the information presented in a more digestible way, where it is more obvious how what was announced in the budget lines up with what is being asked for in the estimates. The President of the Treasury Board is trying to defeat a straw man here, because nobody is saying that it is not better to have that information.

That information should not come at the cost of meaningful oversight, and it does not have to. That is what we heard from the Parliamentary Budget Officer. Frankly, it is what we heard from the President of the Treasury Board when he referred to the Australian model as the gold standard.

Australia does not have a huge omnibus central vote for all of the new budget initiatives. Australia has a Department of Finance and a treasury board secretariat that co-operate in advance of the budget being released. They communicate to the departments which initiatives on their departmental wish lists are going to get into the budget. Then they work with those departments to do the rigorous costing process and to run those programs through treasury board before the budget is announced. That allows them to table their main estimates at the same time as the budget without asking Parliament to sacrifice its power of oversight, without telling parliamentarians that they cannot answer questions about how to spend the money because they have not figured it out yet.

It is important to note that the model that the President of the Treasury Board is invoking as a justification for what he is doing does not support the idea of a central budget vote. It is something very different.

It is lamentable that the President of the Treasury Board did not get buy-in from his colleagues in government in order to be able to accomplish that feat. I recognize that cultural change within an organization is not easy but it is incumbent upon the minister to get that job done within government. For him to impose a lack of accountability on Parliament and to undermine the work of parliamentarians in terms of holding the government to account with respect to the government's financial plan is wrong. It is not the place of the executive to undermine the authority of this place with respect to financial matters.

That is a major problem. I cannot stress enough the frustration that I feel when we listen to members on that side talking about how we have to suffer this red herring about coordinating the two documents. There were lots of ways that the budget and the estimates could have been better coordinated in terms of the information and cross-referencing of that information without asking parliamentarians not to do their job.

Another issue that deserves to be addressed is the idea of online reporting. I am not opposed to it but I do have a problem with its being a substitute for parliamentarians receiving information in the proper way in this place and having that information tabled in this place.

We all know, without accusing the government of the day of doing anything like this, that some governments are more unscrupulous than others and online information can be changed. When we get official documents in this place they are in a form that is not alterable. If it is published and tabled in the House of Commons, it exists in a particular form and it is public. While a website is public, the information on it can be changed and changed in a way that does not record the fact that it has been changed. It can appear one way one day, and another way on another day.

That is why there is a certain permanency to the documents that are here and that is important. It is a reason why parliamentarians should not be quick to accept promises of online publication as a substitute for documents duly tabled here in the House of Commons.

● (1840)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Greg Fergus (Hull—Aylmer, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, our government strongly believes in increasing transparency in government spending here in Parliament.

[*English*]

I hear some of my colleagues doubting what I am saying, but let me quote how former finance officials, Peter DeVries and Scott Clark, described the criticism of the budget implementation vote. They called it unwarranted. I will share three things they said about the budget implementation vote. First, they said it is "a more comprehensive reconciliation between the budget spending proposals and the estimates". That is what this legislation would now do. Second, they said that there are "sufficient controls to ensure that this Vote cannot be used as a slush fund". Third, they said that this gives parliamentarians, all of the members here in the House, "more information than in the past".

I am proud of this. Many parliamentarians are proud of these initiatives and efforts toward increasing transparency and accountability. I would ask the hon. member, who follows this issue very closely, what he has to say about the thoughts of these former senior mandarins and public servants at Finance Canada.

● (1845)

Mr. Daniel Blaikie: Mr. Speaker, I would say they spoke like true mandarins. One of the jobs of parliamentarians is to hold the government to account and it does not come as a surprise to me, and I say this without any disrespect to their careers or talent, that people who came up through government would be very trusting of government to look over its own shoulder and police itself. That is not our job in this place and I humbly submit to the member that if that is the job he wants, he is welcome to join the public service. However, in this place, it is our job to keep an eye on the government to make sure it lives up to what it says it is going to do, and we cannot do that if it does not tell us what it is planning to do with the money before we approve the funds. Finding out about it after does not work.

Let us say I am renovating my house. My contractor tells me what it is going to cost for a new kitchen, and I say, okay, and give him the money. If he says he is going to build me a kitchen and when it is done, he will show me the receipts and I will see then how it looks, I am going to say, hold on. I want input. I want to know what kind of flooring he is going to put in. I want to know what kinds of cabinets he is going to put in. I want to know whether it will have a dishwasher. Those are all things that I, as the customer, want to know and have a right to ask. I will not approve the cost for a kitchen renovation and find out it looks nothing like what I thought I was signing up for. That is the model of this budget implementation vote and it does not make sense from the point of view of financial accountability.

Mr. Kelly McCauley (Edmonton West, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague from Elmwood—Transcona for his excellent speech and his work fighting the Liberal slush fund.

One of the main problems with this slush fund, which has been pointed out by the Parliamentary Budget Officer, is that not one penny of that $7.4 billion shows up in the departmental plans of the government, not one penny. I am going to read what the departmental plans are for. They describe departmental priorities, strategic outcomes, programs, expected results, and associated revenue. It lists expected results and outcomes, so we will not see the expected outcomes of one penny of the $7.4 billion.

I am going to give a perfect example of that. In vote 40, there is $102 million to provide clean and safe drinking water on reserve. I agree 100% that it is needed. The Library of Parliament just put out a report saying that 35 more reserves requiring boil water advisories have been added since the government took over. It has reduced some, but added 35. The issue is that there is $100 million in this slush fund, but not one penny of it is shown in the departmental plan. There is no transparency shown by the government as to how it is going to spend that money or provide clean and safe drinking water for the reserves.

I would ask my colleague if he believes this shows accountability or transparency on behalf of the government for this slush fund.

Mr. Daniel Blaikie: Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for raising the issue of departmental plans. This spending was not appearing in departmental plans. It undermined the study of the estimates process and was not in keeping with the procedure and practice of this place. I felt this was so serious that I raised a point of order to that effect. The Speaker ruled and I will not comment on his ruling. However, it is an important issue. Departmental plans are supposed to be the place we go to understand what government does in its spending and what it plans to do, and to hold it to account.

Departmental plans are part 3 of the estimates. They are a formal document. They are meant to provide, in a contained document, both the funding requests and what government plans to do with the money. Now, by having this central vote, we have all this other information hanging out there that parliamentarians do not see as part of the ordinary process of studying the estimates. Hence we saw a lot of confusion. Things that should have been asked at other committees were not. They were at our committee, OGGO, instead. Then we had the kind of circus of a meeting with 12 to 14 different officials from many departments trying to talk to one committee about it.

Not having this information in the departmental plans, even in the short term, has created a lot of confusion about how to study this and come to an accurate judgment about whether the numbers in the estimates make sense. In the long term, it creates a problem as well by having that information housed outside of the normal departmental plans.

● (1850)

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is great that we finally have a government that has recognized that things need to change at times. I remember hearing that argument when I was in opposition in the Manitoba legislature. The New Democrats reduced the hours of estimates from 240 to 120. They argued that we should take into consideration technology and the different types of tools that were there.

If we look at that, opposition members, and all members, of the chamber have a very important role. All sorts of tools over the years have been expanded upon. ATIP, or access to information, is a great example of that. We have Order Paper questions. We have a parliamentary budget officer. We have a national auditor general. We have the Internet, which has really revolutionized, in many ways, access to information.

Would my friend not agree that when we look at making changes, we have to take into consideration the advancement of society? We have seen significant changes. There is more information out there for individuals in the public to see how government spends their money. Would the member not agree that technology quite often changes the way we do things?

Mr. Daniel Blaikie: Mr. Speaker, the member suggested that we should have somewhere between 220 and 240 hours at committee with ministers to examine the estimates, and I wholeheartedly agree with that suggestion.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Pierre Nantel (Longueuil—Saint-Hubert, NDP): Mr. Speaker, since my colleague is reading a classic of Quebec literature set on Île d'Orléans, I will ask my question in French.

I very much respect his knowledge of parliamentary procedure. I find his questions very interesting. Unfortunately, all I heard was the usual Liberal arrogance from the President of the Treasury Board, who casually told the member to just Google the information. Is this kind of royal arrogance not typical of this government?

The President of the Treasury Board essentially just told us to use technology to access the information. They are using modern technology as an excuse to avoid giving parliamentarians the information they need to do their jobs. We certainly must not bother his royal highness across the way.

Mr. Daniel Blaikie: Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for his question.

This initiative is driven by a deep sense of arrogance. It will not work. An initiative like this only works if we believe that opposition members do not have the right to question a majority government. It only works if we think that the government is competent enough and that its position cannot be called into question because it listened to what people had to say.

That is how the government is justifying spending money before informing Parliament. The Liberals must be really arrogant to think that that is enough and that they can ignore the House procedures that have been in place for 150 years. Canadians do not like that attitude. They want better accountability when the government spends their money.

* * *

[*English*]

POINTS OF ORDER

DRAFT APPROPRIATION BILL—MAIN ESTIMATES, 2018-19—SPEAKER'S RULING

The Deputy Speaker: I am now prepared to rule on the point of order raised earlier today by the hon. member for Edmonton West regarding the form of the appropriation bill to be considered later today.

● (1855)

[*Translation*]

I thank the hon. member for having raised this point, as well as the hon. parliamentary secretary to the government House leader, the hon. chief opposition whip, and the hon. member for Elmwood—Transcona for their interventions.

[*English*]

The hon. member for Edmonton West argued that certain provisions of the supply bill are not properly aligned with the content of the main estimates transmitted to the House by Her Excellency on April 16, 2018. More specifically, he was concerned that the wording of vote 40 under Treasury Board Secretariat, the budget implementation vote, contains new elements not originally found in the main estimates. He felt that this was inappropriate, as this language had not been considered by the standing committee and will not be concurred in by the House when it votes on the estimates later today. By modifying the language found in the bill, he felt the government was inventing new authority and purposes other than what had been communicated to the House by Her Excellency when the Estimates were presented.

[*Translation*]

The hon. parliamentary secretary noted that the Standing Orders require that the appropriation bill be based on the estimates. He noted that this language is similar to that found in Standing Order 83 (4) regarding bills based on ways and means motions. In his mind, there was no doubt that the appropriation bill was based on the main estimates.

[*English*]

The hon. member for Elmwood—Transcona argued that each item in the main estimates contains an amount and a destination, as described in the vote wording. Since the vote wording lays out the purpose of the spending and the conditions governing the spending, he argued that the government could only change it through the supplementary estimates or by new legislation. He did not feel the government had the prerogative to change the form of its request, especially after it had already been reviewed and approved by committee.

[*Translation*]

Standing Order 81(21) provides as follows:

> The adoption of any motion to concur in any estimate or estimates shall be an Order of the House to bring in a bill or bills based thereon.

[*English*]

This provision is particularly significant given the way the House considers supply. The main estimates lay out the government's spending plans. They are first tabled and then studied by committees over a period of several weeks. They contain an annex with the proposed items to be included in the schedule to the appropriation act. The supply bill is, by rule, considered at all stages in a single sitting, generally without debate or possibility of amendment. Such a process only makes sense if the supply bill is closely aligned with the main estimates. Indeed, the practice of distributing the supply bill at the beginning of the final allotted day, rather than when the bill is read a first time, developed, in part, because it is based on the main estimates. Similarly, the practice of allowing a member of the official opposition to ask, during the committee of the whole proceedings, if the bill is in the usual form, is yet another opportunity to reassure the House that there are no unexpected surprises in the bill

[*Translation*]

The essential question, then, is what is meant by the words "based thereon". As the parliamentary secretary mentioned, similar phrasing is used in Standing Order 83(4) regarding bills based on ways and means motions. While the chief opposition whip argued that this is not an appropriate comparison, I note that in both cases a motion must first be concurred in before a bill based thereon can be introduced. In one case, it is a motion to concur in the estimates, while in the other, it is concurrence in the ways and means motion.

Speaker Jerome, in a ruling interpreting what is now Standing Order 83(4), said at pages 224 and 225 of the *Journals* of December 18, 1974:

> It must be assumed that if it was intended that the bills be required to be identical to the motion, the rule would say so.

He added:

> Obviously, the most desirable practice is for the bill to adhere strictly to the provisions of the motion, and departures, if any, ought to be the subject of the strictest interpretation.

● (1900)

[*English*]

In that case, he noted that the rate and incidence of a tax, in the ways and means motion and the associated bill, were the same and that none of the provisions of the bill appeared to extend beyond what was in the ways and means motion.

I believe that these precedents are instructive to the case before us today. The difference between the wording of vote 40 as found in the main estimates and that found in the appropriation bill, is the addition of the words, "…set out under that department or other organization's name in that Annex, in an amount that does not exceed the amount set out opposite that initiative in that Annex." The amount of the vote is the same. The purposes of the vote are the same. The additional wording imposes certain conditions to the funding.

While I agree with the hon. member for Elmwood—Transcona that the government does not have a wide-ranging prerogative to modify the terms and conditions of the proposed spending, in this case, I note that the new language appears to be consistent with the information provided elsewhere in the main estimates. For example, the description of vote 40 found at part II, page 261 of the main estimates indicates that it is for measures approved and identified in Table A2.11 of the budget, measures which are essentially reproduced in the annex of the main estimates for the present fiscal year. I have some difficulty concluding, then, that the bill is not based on the main estimates.

Therefore, in the present circumstances, I am prepared to find that the bill is properly before the House. Of course, to echo the words of Speaker Jerome, it would be most desirable that the bill adhere as strictly as possible to the main estimates. Were the variation more significant, the Chair's conclusion could very well be different.

[*Translation*]

I thank hon. members for their attention.

* * *

[*English*]

MAIN ESTIMATES, 2018-19

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 1—NORTHERN PIPELINE AGENCY

The House resumed consideration of Motion No. 1.

Mr. Scott Simms (Coast of Bays—Central—Notre Dame, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am thankful for this time to speak on this particular issue today. I know we have a long evening ahead of us, but if members can bear with me for a few moments, I will bring forward my thoughts and some of my findings based on my experience and on my work in my riding.

I will be sharing my time with the able and honourable member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell, a beautiful riding just to the east of us here.

I am proud to stand today and talk about our government's plan to put people first and ensure equality and fairness for all Canadians. We know that providing Canadians with the opportunity to realize their full potential is not just the right thing to do; it is the smart thing to do for our economy. By investing to create these opportunities for all Canadians, in all their diversity, we are instilling confidence and reinforcing the foundation for a stronger middle class and a growing economy for the benefit of all.

I would like to spend a few minutes outlining the key elements of that plan, which are included in the supply bill before us today.

It is about a stronger economy that benefits all Canadians. A confident, growing middle class is driving economic growth, creating new jobs and more opportunities to succeed. Our plan is working, because Canadians are working.

Over the last two years, Canadians have worked hard to grow our economy, creating 60% more jobs than the previous Conservative government over the same time period and driving the unemployment rate down to a 40-year low. Middle-class Canadians are now feeling more optimistic about their future, whether their plan is to pay down debt, save for a first home, go back to school to train for a new job, or ease their way into retirement.

In my riding, the average age is fairly high. The issue of those in the middle class transitioning into their senior years is, of course, a very important one, which we find addressed in the bill as well.

The very first thing we did as a government was to raise taxes on the top 1% so that we could lower them for the middle class. Also, through the Canada child benefit, we increased support for nine out of 10 families, putting more money, tax-free, into the pockets of parents for them to spend on things they need. That means more money for books, skating lessons, or warm clothes for winter. These are important achievements for the middle class and the people working hard to join it.

We know there is still hard work ahead of us before we meet our full potential, and there are challenges that must be overcome. We also know that some of our greatest challenges present the greatest opportunities. In the 150-year existence of our country, we certainly know that to be true.

On the international stage, we are members of the G7, and we punch way above our weight, whether it is the strength of our economy or the strength of the exports that we push around the world.

By creating these opportunities, the government is taking action through budget 2018 to make sure that the benefits of a growing economy are felt by more and more people.

We are creating opportunities that draw strength from our diversity to build a country where every Canadian has a real and fair chance to work, to contribute to our economy, and to succeed. That includes Canada's talented, ambitious, and hard-working women. That is why in budget 2018 we focused on issues such as promoting equal parenting for new families, with a proposed new EI parental sharing benefit, and tackling the gender wage gap. In short, it is fundamental to a strong and growing middle class. By building on this understanding, the government, through budget 2018, takes us further than ever before toward a stronger Canada.

I would like to talk in detail about one of the things we have been working on for quite some time, first as a party in opposition and now in government.

We know that Canadians are working hard to build a better life for themselves and their families. Low-income Canadians are sometimes working two or three jobs so that they can join the middle class and give their children and grandchildren a better chance at success. Like all Canadians, they deserve to have their hard work rewarded with greater opportunities and a fair chance at success.

● (1905)

That is why, in budget 2018, we introduced the new Canada workers benefit, a new tax benefit that would put more money into the pockets of low-income workers. The new Canada workers benefit builds on the former working income tax benefit, or WITB, to give even more people greater financial benefits from working. The government is also ensuring that, starting in 2019, every tax filer who could benefit from the new CWB will benefit, by proposing changes that would allow the Canada Revenue Agency to automatically determine eligibility for those who do not make a claim.

We have also enhanced access to the Canada child benefit, which we have talked about quite a bit here simply because we are quite proud of what we have done over the last little while. It is a tax-free benefit, especially for those with young families. We fought a gruelling campaign over this issue. We came out on the successful side, promising to do just this, and we are delivering it after two years. Like the Canada workers benefit, the Canada child benefit, or CCB, is a cornerstone in our plan to strengthen the middle class.

We recognize that indigenous communities, in particular remote and northern indigenous communities, face distinct barriers to accessing federal benefits such as the CCB. That is why, in budget 2018, we expanded efforts to reach out to indigenous communities and to conduct pilot outreach activities for urban indigenous communities as well.

I recall that in the last Parliament we sat in front of many stakeholders in the indigenous community and first nations. In Newfoundland and Labrador, I have the only reserve on the island, which is Conne River, or Miawpukek. I remember some of them talking about their concerns for their brothers and sisters who were in urban areas yet full members of their own reserve. They were deeply concerned about the fact that a lot of first nations people living in larger centres were not able to access some of the government funding and programs that were available. That became a priority for many of us, me included, not just about first nations, but all indigenous people in Newfoundland and Labrador, particularly in Labrador.

These efforts would ensure that indigenous people are better able to access the full range of federal social benefits, including the Canada child benefit, putting money into the pockets of those who are unable to afford basic goods for young children. That is what we built our campaign around.

In closing, these investments in budget 2018, included in the supply bill before us today, recognize that new opportunities and equality are at the heart of Canada's future economic success. Fairness demands equality, and the prosperity of all Canadians depends on it. Certainly in an area such as my own, where the unemployment rate is high, we seek out ways so that people can re-educate themselves. We seek out ways by which they can find other forms of income by retraining and other methods.

For seniors, we want to provide a blanket security that provides them with a living and with services so they can continue to enjoy their moments as they slip into their senior years.

By promoting equality, our government will help create long-term prosperity for the middle class and those working hard to join it.

On the other issues we have talked about in the House, both in the past and now as we lead up to this prosperity of a burgeoning middle class and low unemployment rates, I would say that it is best for us not just to create the jobs by which these people would have income relief available to them in case of unexpected job loss, but also to create a just society they can live in.

● (1910)

One of the programs I am very proud of is the new horizons for seniors program. It is not a recent program; it has been around since the early 2000s. I bring up this program because it is an investment in the social well-being of our seniors.

I recently returned from a trip regarding the OECD. Many countries were fascinated by the new horizons program, because it provides a social benefit to seniors that they have not seen before. Many countries get deeply concerned about financial well-being, and it is true that this is the cornerstone, but to build upon that for our seniors is very important. There are other programs associated with it, also for the middle class. That is why we are very proud of the Canada child benefit.

Mrs. Cheryl Gallant (Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that the Liberals have decided to continue our Conservative plan, the new horizons for seniors program. It has been very beneficial. In my riding, many seniors have benefited from it and continue to do so.

My question has to do with people who are submitting their income taxes. I believe he referred to a special program for low-income individuals, wherein they were able to submit their income taxes by calling a 1-800 number and just plugging in the numbers as they go along. We had feedback from this process. Individuals who may not be scholars when it comes to numbers and accounting to begin with can make mistakes when punching in numbers on the phone, and they are not receiving anything in paper. It is just a matter of going through the process and reporting their income tax using a phone tree in order to continue their child benefits through the government.

I am wondering if the member opposite knows of any way these people can be helped, especially when they make a mistake and end up getting nothing after going through this phone tree program?

● (1915)

Mr. Scott Simms: Mr. Speaker, in many cases I find the same instances. What happens is that a lot of people make mistakes and get caught in a system where they fall through the cracks. Then they come to us and it becomes a longer process for them to receive their refund.

The paper issue was also a big one, which we returned to in many cases. People want to have the paper return instead of just going online. I am from a rural riding, and some communities do not even have high-speed Internet. That makes it even worse.

Connect to innovate is a program we invested in just a short time ago, which is trying to bridge that gap. I hope that down the road we can bridge that gap for low-income earners as well.

In the meantime, for the 1-800 number, what happens is that we bring them into our office and we do it in front of them on the computer if need be. The member is right. That should be rectified. I do not know of any particular instance, and due to privacy laws I cannot talk about it.

The final point I would like to make is that the new horizons for seniors program was developed, implemented, and put in the House, and in this country, by former prime minister Paul Martin.

Mr. Daniel Blaikie (Elmwood—Transcona, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I want to return to one of the general themes of tonight's debate, which has to do with the budget implementation vote and what that means for parliamentary accountability for government with respect to its spending.

I offered up a hyperbolic example earlier today, imagining some of the different ways the government might say it is strengthening the Canada Border Services Agency with the $54 million that is in vote 40. I suggested that it would matter to parliamentarians whether the government was deciding to hire more officers to patrol the border, to buy guns, or to build a wall. It is reasonable for parliamentarians to ask that question.

However, a slightly less hyperbolic example that gets at the same thing is that, in these estimates, the Privy Council Office has asked for about $750,000 to support a new federal leaders' election debate process. The consortium that has sometimes done the debates in the past has said that it usually costs about $250,000 to do the debates for an election, so it could do at least three elections worth of debates for $750,000. The government is projecting that it may spend $5 million next year, and we do not know if that money is for consultation, or to set up an office. We do not know what that money is for, and the PCO has said it does not know what it is for, either.

Does the member think it is acceptable for parliamentarians to be approving funding when we have no idea how the government would decide to support the goals it has stated for the funds?

Mr. Scott Simms: Mr. Speaker, God forbid I delve into hyperbole, because I have only done that for 14 years. I will leave that aside for now.

I am on the procedure and House affairs committee, and we have talked about this quite a bit, about the commitment toward this type of debating and the commission for that. The reflection of the spending is obviously hard to peg when one does not know exactly how this will be set up down the road. A lot of the heavy lifting is going to be done, whether by the private sector or whomever, based on what the commission recommends.

However, I will go back to the ruling from earlier. What the member is talking about may relate to Standing Order 83(4) and Speaker Jerome's ruling. What we are talking about here is the notion of assuming that they are identical in their current form. That is what I think the Speaker was getting at earlier, and I would agree with his ruling on what Speaker Jerome said previously.

Mr. Francis Drouin (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we have had a spirited debate in the House and in multiple committees on this year's main estimates. We have also had a spirited debate about the important reforms that our government has introduced as a two-year pilot to improve the transparency and accountability of government spending.

Today, I would like to spend my time highlighting why we are pursuing these important reforms, and what we have achieved thus far.

The main estimates are a fundamental document, outlining the government's spending plans for the fiscal year. This year's main estimates include $113 billion of voted expenditures and another $163 billion of statutory expenditures. These expenditures will ensure our government can continue to deliver on its commitment to Canadians to grow the middle class, protect the environment, and invest in Canadians' priorities.

Allow me to highlight some of those initiatives.

The 2018-19 main estimates propose $2.2 billion for the Department of Health. Our government will continue to help Canadians lead healthier lives and strengthen our universal health care system to quickly adapt to new challenges. The $2.2 billion in the main estimates will help the department deal with the opioid crisis, provide cannabis use education, and renew the federal tobacco control strategy. Part of that funding will also make home care and mental health services more accessible to Canadians.

The main estimates also include $20.4 billion for the Department of National Defence. This funding will support the implementation of Canada's new defence policy, "Strong, Secure, Engaged"; action to prevent and address gender-based violence, harassment, and discrimination; the integration of GBA+ considerations in all of its operations; and major capital projects.

● (1920)

[*Translation*]

I mentioned that the main estimates are a fundamental document outlining the government's spending plans. Naturally, the other fundamental document that outlines the government's spending plans is the budget. The budget sets out the priorities on which the government commits to spending its resources. It is the best guide to what the government is planning to do over the coming year, which explains why budget day is always so important in this town.

[*English*]

However, in years past, there was a major disconnect between these two fundamental documents. The budget was tabled after the main estimates, which meant that the main estimates provided a detailed breakdown of spending plans only superseded and in many ways rendered irrelevant by the budget.

Imagine if a company put out a detailed statement of its plans for the year and then a few weeks later put out another statement laying out the new investments to be made that year, and the two statements had nothing to do with one another. Shareholders would cry foul. They would not accept that the company's detailed breakdown of spending plans for the year had literally nothing in it about the key new investments the company was going to make that same year.

Clearly, most organizations do not operate this way, but up until this year, that is exactly how the federal government operated. It is no surprise that *The Globe and Mail* called the system "bad to the point of absurdity" and "a discredited practice that has only served to keep MPs in the dark about how tax dollars are being spent." As somebody who has been in Parliament for over 20 years—I am obviously not talking about me—and as somebody who has spent the majority of that time on the opposition benches, the President of the Treasury Board understands very well the important role that parliamentarians play in holding government to account and he understood the frustration in being provided with a document in the main estimates that was incomplete, not reconciled to that year's budget, and essentially rendered obsolete when the budget was tabled.

Parliamentary committees devote many meetings to studying the main estimates, as they should, so the government decided that they should be studying a document that is more complete, more relevant, and more up to date. That is one of the reasons we introduced provisional changes to the Standing Orders for this year and next year. These changes allow the budget to be tabled before the main estimates, which means that the two documents can have the appropriate connections to one another. It means that they can be reconciled with one another. It means that the parliamentary study of the main estimates is far more relevant to the current spending priorities of the government.

Two former senior public servants at the Department of Finance, Scott Clark and Peter DeVries, who are well respected for their commitment to fiscal responsibility, have praise for the changes. They call the new system a more comprehensive reconciliation between the budget spending proposals and the estimates, and they said that parliamentarians are now provided with more information than in the past.

We are proud of important improvements to transparency and accountability and it is important to remember that we have demonstrated our respect for Parliament by making these changes provisional. After a two-year pilot, Parliament will have an opportunity to decide whether it wants to continue with these changes. I certainly believe and hope that it will, since returning to a system that was called "bad to the point of absurdity" would be a clear step backward.

[*Translation*]

The alignment of the budget and main estimates is not the only important reform we introduced. We also put in place a pilot project for purpose-based votes that give parliamentarians even more precise control over the review and approval of government spending.

● (1925)

[*English*]

The existing system is built around categories of spending, for example, operating expenditures, capital expenditures, and grants and contributions. Parliament approves a total amount for each department for each of these categories. However, Parliament's discretion is limited to category-level spending. It has been like this for years, but to provide greater control to Parliament, we have piloted a purpose-based vote system at Transport Canada. This means that parliamentary control extends beyond the category of spending and down to the level of what purpose the money will go toward. We think this is another step in the right direction.

I sit on the Standing Committee on Government Operations and Estimates. It is continuing to study how to better improve transparency and accountability to Parliament and I know we will come back with a report in short form.

I am proud of what our government has done thus far and we will continue to do this in the future to improve the transparency and accountability of government spending.

Hon. Erin O'Toole (Durham, CPC): Mr. Speaker, we are talking about transparency. In the budget document, there were 456 mentions of investment spending. The member talked about the Canadian Armed Forces' plan of "Strong, Secure, Engaged". For the largest department of the federal government, DND, the Canadian Forces, do members want to know how many times it was mentioned in the budget? It was zero.

The member talked about transparency. The Minister of National Defence, a few weeks ago, said the government is not lapsing funds for DND. That was proven not to be the case. We are debating main estimates today and when the public accounts come in, we will see how much they match. For a government that talks so much about transparency, why is it continually reprofiling spending for our Canadian Armed Forces, why did they not even merit a mention in the budget, and why is the Minister of National Defence not being clear with Canadians on how much funding the government is lapsing each year?

Mr. Francis Drouin: Mr. Speaker, I do recall, in 2004, the first time the fixed wing search and rescue program was announced, and re-announced in 2008, to be later delayed, and to finally get a procurement going by 2015. Finally, our search and rescue technicians will have planes. This is coming from a government that delayed and delayed defence procurement. The Conservative record on defence procurement is shameful.

I have to remember, tonight, we will be voting for a long time. I recall March 21 was the date that the member for Durham voted against national defence, voted against veterans, and voted against anything that had to do with the Canadian Forces. That is the Conservative record.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Pierre Nantel (Longueuil—Saint-Hubert, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I hope things will calm down a bit here because it is going to be a long night.

As the transportation electrification critic for my party, I attended the electric vehicle show more than a year ago. The Minister of Transport was there to announce a transportation electrification strategy for Canada. Naturally, the entire community is trying to promote this to both consumers and manufacturers. In particular, we could support the people in Windsor who build the Pacifica Hybrid, a technologically advanced plug-in vehicle manufactured in Canada.

All these people would like to see policies that promote the electrification of transportation. Despite the minister's commitment, there is nothing for this in the budget or the supplementary estimates. It made a lot of sense, so this is very disappointing. I would like to hear what my colleague has to say about that.

Mr. Francis Drouin: Mr. Speaker, I am the member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell. Many members from Quebec stop in Casselman. I know that the hon. member for Châteauguay—Lacolle likes to charge her electric car in Casselman.

I know that the hon. member comes from the Montreal area. I invite him to charge his car in Casselman, where there is a nice station for electric cars. He can even buy a coffee there.

[*English*]

Mrs. Cheryl Gallant (Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke, CPC): Mr. Speaker, would the member opposite be able to tell us, with these estimates, whether or not we are going to see any actual deliveries materialize from them? Will we see any ships? The last ship that was delivered was the *Asterix*, something that we started, despite their efforts to crash that project.

Are we going to see any planes delivered? We delivered the C-17s and C-130s. All the Liberals have done is play political football with the fighter jet replacement, looking in the garbage pail in Australia for something to pull out for this made-in-Canada, made-in-cabinet capability gap with our fighter jets.

The Minister of National Defence was not the architect of Operation Medusa, but he was the architect of the capability gap with the fighter jets.

● (1930)

Mr. Francis Drouin: Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the member for her question on defence procurement, because the Conservative record is terrible.

I remember a time when Conservatives cancelled defence procurement for MSVS, not three weeks before, not two weeks before, not one week before, but less than 24 hours to go and they pulled the plug.

How is that instilling confidence in the defence industry in Canada, to pull the plug less than 12 hours before the procurement ended? That is the shameful record of the Conservative Party of Canada when it comes to defence procurement.

Mrs. Cheryl Gallant (Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I will be sharing my time with the member for Moose Jaw—Lake Centre—Lanigan.

As the federal member of Parliament for Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke, I welcome this opportunity to inform Canadians about the estimates, and particularly vote 40. My speech is going to focus on the cover-up and how the carbon tax has given rise to the need for a $7-billion slush fund. Canadians want to know if the $7-billion slush fund is part of the carbon tax cover-up, so I will begin by summarizing the carbon tax.

I am going to start with the carbon tax cover-up that had been going on for years in Ontario and what it has meant to everyday, average Canadians. I am pleased to confirm that once the taxpayers in the province of Ontario became aware of what is known as the "green hustle", they not only removed Kathleen Wynne from office, the red rump that remains is not even recognized as an official party in the legislature.

For the benefit of taxpayers listening to this debate and hearing the term "green hustle" for the first time, here is an explanation of the term. An example of the green hustle is when the Conservative shadow minister of finance, the hon. member for Carleton, asks the finance minister when the government will share with Canadians how much the proposed federal carbon tax of $50 a tonne would cost a median Canadian family and the finance minister is prevented from answering the question by the Prime Minister's principal adviser Gerald Butts.

Instead, the environment minister assumes the role of finance minister and invokes the green hustle by claiming some unsubstantiated benefit to the environment, where none exists. In fact, the evidence shows that adopting carbon taxes in Canada raises global carbon emissions by offshoring economic activity from relatively environmentally friendly places like Canada to places with lax environmental laws.

Data from the World Bank reveals that China and other developing countries produce far more carbon per dollar of economic output, at purchasing power parity, than do western nations. China shows no signs of decreasing its emissions any time soon. China is currently building hundreds of new coal-fired plants, which will ensure carbon dioxide emissions continue to rise for decades to come. Taken together, these facts mean that for every factory pushed out of Canada because of a carbon tax, global emissions will actually increase dramatically, and this will be the case for decades to come.

As a Conservative, I recognize there are many things we can do to improve the environment. A made-in-Canada environmental policy by Canadians for Canadians would be an honest start for the government. Carbon taxes are wrong for the Canadian experience. We live in a cold country which, by its very nature, is energy intensive. Carbon taxes are not neutral. No money will be returned to taxpayers. Carbon taxes are not going to save the planet.

The same tactic of using the environment to cover up the greed was used in Ontario, a tactic that resulted in ratepayers of Ontario paying the highest price for electricity in North America, a tactic that resulted in the Liberal Party of Toronto being reduced to a red rump. Green is the new red.

A failed policy led to energy poverty among seniors and others on fixed incomes who have been forced to choose between heating and eating during the coldest months. With the term "energy poverty" a new expression in Ontario, the Ontario Association of Food Banks put a photo of a light bulb on its 2016 hunger report. For Ontario's rural residents in places like Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke, there was no environmental benefit.

Industrial-scale wind turbines were forced onto unwilling Ontario municipalities and never demonstrated a benefit in cutting carbon dioxide emissions. In fact, according to a journal in the renewables green hustle racket, the way wind power and the carbon tax cover-up were done in Ontario, by covering up the carbon tax on electricity and calling it a "global adjustment", is now a textbook example, a black eye so to speak, on how not to do greed energy.

● (1935)

There is a direct connection between the failed greed energy policies, the carbon tax cover-up of the Toronto Liberal Party, and the federal Liberal Party in Ottawa. Gerald Butts, who is the most powerful unelected technocrat in Ottawa today, held the same as an unelected technocrat in Toronto. The greed energy act that was so thoroughly rejected by voters in Ontario was his creation. The failure of the greed energy act has been well documented. What has not been well reported is how rich it made a select group of Liberal Party insiders. They are people like the $6-million man, Hydro One CEO Mayo Schmidt; and people like Mike Crawley, the former president of the Liberal Party of Ontario, who received a contract for $66,000 a day for 20 years, $478 million, to put up industrial wind turbines. The Liberal Party of Ontario was continually shaking down energy companies for political contributions to keep the money flowing if they wanted to keep their FIT contracts that were making a few select people obscenely wealthy at the expense of Ontario residents struggling with their electricity bills.

Because the wind blows when power is not needed, Ontario ratepayers have paid American border states billions of dollars to take the unusable electricity. The Liberal Party talks about threatening a trade war against our largest trading partner, yet Liberal policy was providing the energy to run American industries in the U.S. border states that compete with Canadian manufacturers. Some of these American industries had been in Ontario, but were forced to leave because of the greed energy act and the high electricity prices it created.

I use the past tense because the new premier of Ontario, Doug Ford, has promised to govern with respect for the taxpayer dollars, something that needs to happen in deficit-obsessed Ottawa and the reason we are debating vote 40 this evening. It is too bad the finance minister is prevented by the Prime Minister and Gerald Butts from being accountable directly to Canadians about the carbon tax cover-up and why the Liberals need a $7-billion slush fund. Canadians want to know if the $7-billion slush fund is part of the carbon tax cover-up.

The motion from the official opposition earlier today was asking for a clear explanation of the costs of the Liberal Party's carbon policy, just like we want to know what the costs of the estimates are for. We know they have the numbers because our finance critic has seen the redacted pages and there will be costs and indirect costs that will escalate throughout the Canadian economy. For example, the Prime Minister needs to understand that his failure to effectively manage trade relations with our largest trading partner and his clumsy attempt to respond to his failures by announcing a trade war can only end badly for Canadians.

In my riding of Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke, tourism is a large employer. As Jeff Wilcox, general manager of Pride Marine Group in Eganville and Ottawa has made me aware, the decision by the Liberal government to target boats as the only recreational product listed for retaliatory tariff will result in millions of dollars in lost wages and taxes. It will have a negative effect on what has been an affordable outdoor activity for middle-class Canadians. Will the $7-billion slush fund help them? Jeff says a single-family house in Toronto has become an unaffordable luxury for middle-class Canadians; so too will being able to afford a boat to enjoy the Canadian outdoors become an unaffordable luxury, thanks to Liberal policy and their failure to secure the North American Free Trade Agreement, and that is just one tariff.

On behalf of all Canadians, I ask, what is the carbon tax cover-up really costing Canadians? By using a carbon tax to rapidly escalate the price of fuel, tourism in my riding, which will be hit by the trade war, will be hit even harder. At $2 a litre for gasoline, the most recent target price from the Liberal government, American and Canadian tourists will be staying home.

The carbon tax cover-up will affect workers' pensions. For too many Canadians, unfortunately, retirement income consists of only the old age security and CPP. The decision by the Liberal Party to push the CPP pension managers to buy into the carbon tax cover-up by purchasing, with workers' pension savings, industrial wind turbines that are being dumped by their foreign owners, jeopardizes the CPP. Already, 77% of Canadians believe the CPP will not be there for them when they are ready to retire.

● (1940)

Mr. Kyle Peterson (Newmarket—Aurora, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, does the member think we are still on the opposition day motion or does she think the speech was supposed to be directed toward the main estimates?

Mrs. Cheryl Gallant: Mr. Speaker, had the member been listening to the beginning of the speech, he would have known that I explained the reason why we are talking about the carbon tax is because Canadians are concerned that it is directly linked to the carbon tax cover-up. They are not showing us, or being transparent in any way, shape, or form, how the $7 billion will be spent, just like they will not tell us how much that carbon tax is going to cost Canadians. Reference was made to the earlier supply day motion.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Pierre Nantel (Longueuil—Saint-Hubert, NDP): Mr. Speaker, my timing is a bit off. The government is telling the others to stay on topic, but what I am interested in is precisely what is off topic.

Does my colleague acknowledge that the climate is changing drastically? What does she propose that we do about it? As long as we are off topic, let us go there.

[*English*]

Mrs. Cheryl Gallant: Mr. Speaker, a carbon tax, a $7-billion slush fund, is not going to affect the climate, it is not going to affect the carbon dioxide levels. Carbon dioxide makes up only 4% of earth's atmosphere. Of that 4%, 3.4% is attributed to anthropological activity. In any case, it is the never-ending goose with the golden egg for carbon tax because no matter how much we increase carbon taxes and cut CO_2 emissions, it is never going to have an impact on CO_2 levels in the atmosphere. Carbon dioxide is not a toxic gas. Plants breathe it in and exhale oxygen, so the time to stop talking about carbon dioxide being a poisonous gas has long since ended.

Mr. Harold Albrecht (Kitchener—Conestoga, CPC): Mr. Speaker, what we do know about the carbon tax is according to the Parliamentary Budget Officer, it is going to take $10 billion out of the Canadian economy in 2022. That is a huge hit to the economy. As my colleague has pointed out, it does nothing to reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

Even at committee, the Minister of Environment was asked how much reduction of greenhouse gas emissions we can expect from this carbon tax. That question was not answered. Now we also know that the Liberals are not answering the question about how much it will cost the average Canadian family. It has been blocked out. Even though the party on the other side knows full well what it will cost, we do not have that information.

In my colleague's riding I am sure there are a number of farmers, and I wonder if she has had the opportunity to connect with farmers as to their view of what the carbon tax will do to their livelihood.

● (1945)

Mrs. Cheryl Gallant: Mr. Speaker, farmers among other people in my riding understand the difference between climate and weather. One thing farmers do is grow plants and vegetation. Those plants and vegetation actually take carbon dioxide, the dreaded gas the Liberals are so afraid of, out of the air and produce food with it. However, with the extra taxes on fuel and the taxes on transporting their livestock from point A to point B, and all the other costs that are going to ensue because of the carbon tax, it is going to make life unaffordable for them. Their prices will have to be raised and it is going to make food more expensive. When food becomes more expensive, the people with the lowest incomes in society are the ones who suffer the most.

Mr. Tom Lukiwski (Moose Jaw—Lake Centre—Lanigan, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join in tonight's debate on the main estimates. Most Canadians who follow parliamentary procedure understand that the main estimates are all about granting spending authority to the government. Therefore, for the next few minutes I want to talk a bit about spending, not so much in the context of the main estimates, but more in the context of the out-of-control spending that is being exhibited by the current government.

To get a fulsome view of what I mean, I want to go back a few years to 2015. During the 2015 election campaign, the Liberal Party at the time made many campaign promises, most of which of course it has broken. However, I want to focus in on only one of those broken promises, and that is the promise that the Liberals made that, if elected, they would run modest deficits of no more than $10 billion, and that they would be temporary. The Liberals also promised that these temporary $10-billion deficits would be eliminated by the end of their first term; in other words, they were saying that they would be back to balanced by 2019. That is not just a broken promise, that is a shattered promise, because we are nowhere near balancing the federal budget by next year. In fact, we have found from documents provided by the government's own finance department that even if there is no new spending, the earliest the government could see a balanced budget would be the year 2045. To put it another way, if a 16-year old young man or young woman today wanted to see a balanced budget in this country, he or she would be 44 years old by the time that happened. It is shameful what the government is doing to the finances of this country.

We should not be surprised because, after all, excessive spending is in the Liberal DNA. We have seen this time and again over successive Liberal governments. In fact, the current Prime Minister's own father, Pierre Elliott Trudeau, when he was in power for 16 years, was considered the most profligate spender probably in parliamentary history. To prove my point, I would offer this observation.

In 1984, when former Prime Minister Trudeau finally left office, Canadians and the Canadian government were spending $1.03 for every dollar that it took in in revenue. We should think about that for just a moment. How can Canadians who try and run an efficient household balance their own budgets if they continuously borrow and go further into debt? It cannot be done. Eventually, the rope runs out, the borrowing has to end, and the debt has to be repaid. Unfortunately, the current government does not seem to recognize that, because it continues to borrow and rack up massive deficits and incur more debt. Referring back to former Prime Minister Trudeau, Canadians are still trying to pay off the debt that he incurred during his 16 years in office.

We have also seen that the apple does not fall far from the tree, because the current Prime Minister has taken the same Keynesian approach to fiscal management, or in his case mismanagement, that we have seen from his father. We have seen the current Prime Minister rack up deficit upon deficit with no idea how to balance his own budget or the budget of his government.

That attitude has actually prevailed upon the current finance minister. I point out that only a few short weeks ago, the finance minister appeared himself before the finance committee. During that testimony, he was asked on multiple occasions by the Conservative finance critic, the hon. member for Carleton, when the federal budget would be balanced. On multiple occasions he was asked that very simple question, and the finance minister could not respond, and did not respond. The reason he could not and did not respond is quite simple. It is because the finance minister does not know when the budget will be balanced.

● (1950)

I think that is absolutely shameful, that the chief financial officer of our country does not even know when his own budget can be balanced or will be balanced. No Canadian taxpayer should have to put up with that ineptness. We see it time and time again by the government, in everything it does, in every public document it puts forward.

It is not just this massive deficit that the government is racking up that is of concern. To exacerbate the problem of the runaway deficits, the government continues to raise taxes on Canadians. One of the other broken promises by the Liberal government during the 2015 campaign is that it would lower taxes for the middle class, but it has done just the opposite. In fact, a recent study published by the Fraser Institute indicates that over 80% of Canadians today are paying more taxes than they did in 2015. They are paying higher income taxes and payroll taxes.

Now, on top of all of that, the Liberal government wants to introduce a job-killing carbon tax. We heard earlier today, from several of my colleagues, the problems with this so-called revenue-neutral carbon tax. Let us be clear, there is nothing revenue-neutral about the proposed carbon tax, nothing even remotely close to it.

The simplest way to try to explain how a carbon tax is supposed to work, according to the Liberal government, is that for every dollar taxed Canadians, to disincentivize them from perhaps using oil or gas or any other non-renewable resource, the government would refund that money back to that individual. It is simply not true. If it was, if every time I was taxed $100, I knew I was getting $100 back, why would the government bother taxing me to begin with? It makes absolutely no sense.

According to the government, its rationale is this, if we disincentivize all Canadians by raising prices on everything, on home heating, on gas, on oil, they will stop using those products, they will change their consumer habits, and they will stop using things that the government thinks are pollutants.

That does not work. All we need to do is take a look at what is happening today in British Columbia, where the gas prices for a litre of gas is on the north side of $1.60 a litre. Has that changed consumer habits? No. Why has it not? Quite simply, Canadians still need to get to work, soccer moms need to take their kids to the soccer pitch on Saturday morning, and $1.60 a litre does not stop them from doing it. All it does is it takes more money out of their pockets, and it makes them and all Canadians far worse off and far less affluent.

This is the record of the Liberal Party: higher deficits, higher taxes, and now a threat to impose a job-killing carbon tax. A year from now, in 2019, Canadians will be given a clear choice. Do they want to re-elect a government that has raised taxes, that has increased deficits and debt, and that has imposed a carbon tax, or do they want to elect a Conservative government that will lower taxes and balance budgets?

I can assure the House that I have the utmost respect for the intelligence of the Canadian taxpayer, and because of that I know, come 2019, we will be seeing a new Conservative majority government here in Ottawa.

● (1955)

Mr. Majid Jowhari (Richmond Hill, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, let me talk about the records. These are the same Conservatives who got taken to court, because the Parliamentary Budget Officer could not get information.

These are the same Conservatives who referred to the former Parliamentary Budget Officer as "unbelievable, unreliable, incredible".

These are the same Conservatives who took millions from the border infrastructure fund to build gazebos and fake lakes.

These are the same Conservatives who formed the first government in the history of the British Commonwealth to be found in contempt.

What does the member opposite have to say about those records?

Mr. Tom Lukiwski: Mr. Speaker, number one, I welcome the question. I appreciate the question from my hon. colleague, my friend from our shared committee of OGGO.

The only suggestion I would have to my colleague is that perhaps the next time, rather than reading a question written by Gerald Butts, he could actually speak from his heart and his head. That would be far more effective, and I think Canadians would appreciate that far more than his reading someone else's words.

The record of the Liberal government does not change things. It has been the most egregious spender of government and taxpayer money in history. I told the story of the former prime minister Pierre Elliott Trudeau, and it is true, for every dollar his government took in in taxes, it spent $1.03. It is impossible to balance budgets under that scenario. That is why we are in debt. That is why we need a change of government.

Mr. Ziad Aboultaif (Edmonton Manning, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is in the craziness of what the government is doing, when expectation is so high, that the government wants Canadians to sign a blank cheque for them with respect to a carbon tax grab without telling them the cost and how much the emissions will be reduced.

Who is crazy enough to give the government a blank cheque? I would like my colleague to comment on that, please.

Mr. Tom Lukiwski: Mr. Speaker, my esteemed colleague is right about one thing: Who in their right mind would want to give the government a blank cheque for anything? We know what number it would fill in. Frankly, it would be a figure that the Canadian taxpayer could not afford.

Specifically to his question about the carbon tax, I note we have asked on numerous occasions in this place a simple question to the government: What will the carbon tax cost the average Canadian household. We have yet to get an answer. Although the government knows the answer and has those documents, it is not providing anything. For a party that said it was running on transparency and openness, it is doing anything but. The government has the answer to the very simple question of how much the carbon tax will cost the average Canadian household, but any documents it has provided have been so heavily redacted that there is no information.

The government is hiding basic facts and financial information from the Canadian taxpayer, and for that, it should be sorely ashamed.

Mr. Adam Vaughan (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Families, Children and Social Development (Housing and Urban Affairs), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this is about the 18th or 19th time I have heard about this mythical document, which was commissioned by the Harper government and delivered as a public report before the Prime Minister was even sworn in, and it is somehow being related to what this government has done. It is a Harper document that the Harper cabinet forgot to take with it when it left.

What does the policy we put in place have anything to do with anything Stephen Harper did? What report did Stephen Harper commission? I do not even know what members are talking about when they refer to this report. This report was put in place and tabled before the Liberals were sworn in. Why do the members opposite want it so much? If they want it so much, why do they not ask one of Harper's former cabinet ministers for it?

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

● (2000)

Mr. Tom Lukiwski: Mr. Speaker, it really does not surprise me when I hear a Liberal member say, "I do not know what you are talking about". That is par for the course. I wish the Liberals would understand what we are talking about, because perhaps then they would take some of our sage advice such as reducing deficits, lowering taxes, and not imposing a carbon tax.

Try as we might, the helpfulness we are exhibiting today, and what I am saying to my friend opposite to help him understand basic facts, do not seem to be working. It is unfortunate but true. I wish the Liberals would listen more intently.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): I just want to remind the hon. members that if they want to cross the floor to speak with someone on the other side, that is allowed. Chirping back and forth while someone is trying to answer or ask a question makes it difficult for the Speaker. We do not want to upset the Speaker now, do we?

The hon. member for Mississauga—Erin Mills.

Ms. Iqra Khalid (Mississauga—Erin Mills, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I will be splitting my time with the hon. and very dynamic member for Newmarket—Aurora.

Canadians may not hear about the over 24 hours of voting on the estimates that will start tonight, but they will definitely feel the impact of our government's plan to put people first and ensure that equality and fairness is there for all Canadians. On this side of the House, we know that providing Canadians with the opportunity to realize their full potential is not just the right thing to do, it is the smart thing to do for our economy. By investing to create opportunities for women and men, in all their diversity, the government is instilling confidence and reinforcing the foundation for a stronger middle class and for growing the economy that benefits all of us.

I am a big believer in empowering women to change the way we do politics; to change the way we do business, STEM, and community building; and to change the way we do everything.

I would like to spend a few minutes outlining the key elements of budget 2018's support for Canada's women and girls, which are included in the supply bill before us today. I would like to spend some time discussing the data behind budget 2018's focus on women and girls.

Even though Canadian women are among the best educated in the world, they are less likely to participate in the labour market than men and more likely to work part time. On average, women in Canada earn 69¢ for every dollar earned by men, on an annual basis. Canadian women are under-represented in positions of leadership, and businesses in Canada are overwhelmingly owned by men. The number of women in economically transformative STEM remains low. Women who graduate from STEM fields typically earn an average of $9,000 a year less than their male peers. The demands of unpaid work are too often preventing women from pursuing opportunities to reach their full potential. This is holding back half of all Canadians from reaching their full potential and the full potential of what our country is able to accomplish. It is holding our economy back.

RBC *Economic Research* estimates that adding more women to the workforce could boost the level of Canada's GDP by as much as 4%. McKinsey Global Institute estimates that by taking steps to advance equality for women, such as employing more women in technology and boosting women's participation in the workforce, Canada could add $150 billion to its economy by 2026.

Empowering women and girls will help close the gender gap that holds back growth and increases poverty. Simply put, equality between Canadian women and men will lead to greater prosperity, not just for women and their families but for all Canadians. With equality of opportunity as a guiding principle, budget 2018 takes us further toward this stronger Canada than ever before.

Let me give some examples, some of which, I might add, are included in the supply bill before us today. To support young families and gender equality in both the workplace and the home, our government is introducing a new employment insurance parental sharing benefit that will help support an equal distribution of home and work responsibilities. This will provide an additional five weeks of EI parental benefits when both parents agree to share parental leave or an additional eight weeks for those who choose the extended parental benefit option.

With budget 2018, we are looking at federal institutions and providing a leadership role in addressing the systemic under-valuation of women. That is because we know that equal pay for work of equal value is a human right. Through budget 2018, we are addressing the gender wage gap by announcing that we will introduce historic proactive pay equity legislation in the federally regulated sector, which would apply to about 1.2 million employed Canadians.

We are also looking at how we can better support women entrepreneurs in starting and growing their businesses and taking them global. Our government is committed to helping women-owned businesses grow, find new customers, and hire more Canadians. To help make this a reality, the Business Development Bank of Canada and Export Development Canada are making $1.65 billion in new financing over three years available to women entrepreneurs.

● (2005)

Empowering women to build their businesses and create jobs just makes good economic sense. Here at home, it is also important that we continue to break down barriers to gender equality in education and in employment.

In my riding of Mississauga—Erin Mills, I have established the Women's Council, dynamic women tasked with empowering more women at the grassroots level. The breaking of barriers is key to reducing poverty and building an economy that works for everyone.

Budget 2018 proposes to help women enter and succeed in the trades by creating a new apprenticeship incentive grant for women. The grant will encourage women to enter the trades and fill positions that offer high-quality, well-paying, middle-class jobs.

On this side of the House, we know that equality is at the heart of Canada's future economic success. Fairness demands equality, and prosperity and growth for all Canadians depends on it. Canadians work hard every day. They take care of their families, run businesses and public institutions, protect communities, and create the art that shapes our culture and reminds us of what it means to be Canadian. For all they do, all Canadian women and men deserve to be equal partners in society and equal participants in the economy. Through budget 2018 and the measures listed in the supply bill we are debating today, we want to help make this goal a reality.

When women have equal opportunities to succeed, they can be powerful agents of change and economic growth, improving the quality of life for families and communities. I have seen that first-hand in my riding of Mississauga—Erin Mills through my Women's Council and through the many women who take part in the economy in business and in not-for-profit organizations. I have seen their contributions to our country and the way we function as a whole. I know that, through budget 2018, we will continue to empower more women to take ownership, take leadership, and own the country that is Canada.

Ms. Rachael Harder (Lethbridge, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I would ask the member to help me understand something. On the opposite side of the House, we have a so-called feminist Prime Minister. He has self-reported that he proclaims the empowerment and economic advantage of women.

In the budget, the finance minister and the Prime Minister, two wealthy, white, upper-class men, take the time to outline exactly what it looks like to empower a woman economically. They tell her that she should not be working part time; she should be working full time. They tell her she should not be spending time in the home, if that is her choice; she needs to be contributing to the economy. They tell her that it is not enough to leave the choice up to her in which way she will contribute to the economy; they will actually tell her the way. They go on in the budget to outline that women should be contributing through STEM, the skilled trades, technology, engineering, and these sorts of things. They are not only telling women that it is up to them to decide whether they should work part time or full time, but they are going so far as to tell women exactly the fields they should be entering.

Why is it okay for the Prime Minister to dictate to Canadian women what they should be, what they should do, and how they should spend their time?

● (2010)

Ms. Iqra Khalid: Mr. Speaker, I have to disagree. Canadian women do not need to be told anything. They are empowered.

We, as a feminist government, have the first-ever gender parity in a cabinet. We have a feminist foreign policy. We are investing in women's education in Canada and across the world.

I can tell the member that at the grassroots level, women appreciate the lifting of these systemic barriers that inhibit them. If they choose to pursue a career, they can go ahead and follow the path they are so passionate about to contribute in the way they see fit. It is not about anything other than to provide equality of opportunity for all those who wish to take that opportunity.

Ms. Sheila Malcolmson (Nanaimo—Ladysmith, NDP): Mr. Speaker, it is late in the season, and we are all tired, but for goodness' sake, how many more times are we going to hear a speech like that about feminism and lifting women up? It is embarrassing. The goodwill of the government, the words of the government, and the words of the speech, yes, of course, but it is two and a half years later. It was 42 years ago that the previous prime minister Trudeau said the government was going to implement pay equity. It was 42 years ago, and it still has not happened. There are zero dollars in this budget to implement pay equity. My colleague across the way can say until she is blue in the face how important it is. Why does her government not do it? The Liberals have a majority, they have the mandate, and they have the words, but they have no concomitant action.

They say now they are putting in this great new parental leave benefit. Six in 10 workers in Canada do not qualify for employment insurance, so fix EI and do something with the power you have and fund it in the budget.

This is all rhetoric. It is all flowery words, and I so wish you would just get on with it in the year and a half you have in your mandate and put some action in place for feminism.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): I just want to remind the hon. members to speak through the Speaker, not directly to the other side. I am sure the hon. member did not want me to get on with anything. That is not my position, as a perfectly neutral Speaker.

The hon. member for Mississauga—Erin Mills.

Ms. Iqra Khalid: Mr. Speaker, I really thank the member across the way for all her advocacy on this very important file.

As I mentioned in my speech, I initiated a Women's Council, with 12 very dynamic women in my riding, one of whom is over 70 years of age. She said to me one day, as we were having a meeting about these very same issues, that she could not believe that we were still having to talk about all of this, that we were still, in her words, "burning bras" to really further the cause of feminism.

With this government, this is the most significant step we have taken to acknowledge and to push forward the feminist agenda. We are educating women and girls across the world. We are empowering them through our entrepreneurship initiatives and through lowering small-business taxes, ensuring that we are working toward getting pay equity. I encourage the member across the way to keep up her advocacy. I know that our government and our Prime Minister will continue to advocate for all of these.

Mr. Kyle Peterson (Newmarket—Aurora, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is always an honour to rise in the House with the ability to speak to whatever the topic may be, but today's topic is particularly germane and pertinent to our role as members of Parliament. Our role here is manifold, but prime among our role as members of Parliament and representatives of our constituents, of Canadians is to oversee the expenditures of the government.

This has been a key characteristic of the Westminster model since its inception. I do not have to give you, Mr. Speaker, this historical lesson, but others in the House may benefit from it.

There is no role I take more seriously or spend more time on than reviewing the proposed expenditures of the government. Not only do I have the honour and privilege to speak tonight to this topic, I also have the honour to serve on the Standing Committee on Government Operations and Estimates. Every member of that committee takes his or her role seriously, feels honoured to have it, and knows the important work we do for Canadians and for the budgetary process.

That is why this year I was absolutely thrilled to be part of a groundbreaking process, a game changing process, almost an earth-shattering process in which we had the estimates presented before the budget. Imagine something as bold as that in the Parliament of Canada. We have corrected the errors of the past.

This is a process that needs to be developed. It is not the end of the line; it is the first step. Improvements need to be made, and we all agree with that. I find it very odd that we have the most open and transparent process of budgets and estimates since Confederation, and we are here, probably spending the most time voting on the process. I find it almost ironic, and it would be funny and humorous, that we are all here voting on these items instead of spending time in our ridings and with our loved ones. It is almost like we have to examine everything because how could this possibly be fair? How could this possibly be just? Because it is open and transparent.

The Parliamentary Budget Officer has agreed. We now know what money will be spent before it is spent. We do not get the dollar signs after the budget is approved. Each of dollar of the $7 billion has been itemized. At the government operations committee, 12 departments and their officials were asked about the the expenses. With respect, I asked more questions about the expenses than the members from the party opposite. They wanted to play games and somehow pretend that this was an affront to democracy, an affront to the role of parliamentarians. How could they possibly approve money when they did not know what every dollar would do?

Every year each member of Parliament gets a budget for his or her office. We are not asked where every dollar goes. We get an amount of dollars for the year and next year account for what we have spent. Why is that okay for every member opposite, but not okay for the government at large?

Where was the member for Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan when he received his office budget? Did he say he could not possibly hire any staff or pay any rent because the numbers were not itemized, that he would not take the money? No, he did not and he used every staff member to research every point of history to give his eloquent speeches. Every week he gives a speech. He is not doing the research himself. His staff members are being paid to do that. We do not know how much they are being paid until the year is done. Does he say he does not want their services anymore, or does not want to speak in the House anymore?

● (2015)

Does he say he wants to sit quietly, that he does not want to give the colleague from Winnipeg a run for his money on the number of words spoken? He proudly says, "all my staff work on researching my speeches". They are not working for free. He has the audacity to pretend that he is here, above the rest of us, and that he will not take any money unless he knows what every dime is spent on.

My points may have been exaggerated, but it proves, in my submission, the folly of their argument. That folly is that there is no merit to the argument whatsoever. It is partisan grandstanding. It is end of session games. It is let us see who can think of the best things to do to ensure the session drags on as long as possible.

I take my role very seriously, as every member here knows. Every member here also takes their roles—

● (2020)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): Order, please. I am sure the hon. member would not have to speak so loud if the opposition would keep it down. I would ask everyone to stop heckling and let the hon. member give his speech.

The hon. member for Newmarket—Aurora.

Mr. Kyle Peterson: Mr. Speaker, the point is that we have done our best. We have a marked improvement in the estimates and budgetary process. It is, in fact, the best it has ever been in Canada. There are countries that do it better. Australia, we all know, is the gold standard. However, like many convicts from Great Britain centuries ago, we cannot get to Australia in one try. Therefore, we have to keep working toward the ultimate goal.

I am glad to be a small player in the process that has become getting to the goal of parliamentarians and, by extension, Canadians, knowing where taxpayer dollars are going. It certainly is the fundamental role of parliamentarians, and we have a lot of work to do.

[*Translation*]

Some have complained about the fact that items in budget 2018 do not appear in the departmental plans for this year. However, that is no different from previous years. The budget items appeared in the supplementary estimates a few months after the departmental plans were released. Consequently, the budget initiatives were not in the departmental plans until the following year.

Likewise, this year, the budget initiatives do not appear in the departmental plans, but they will be incorporated into the plans for the following year, so there is no loss of transparency here.

[*English*]

That is the point, and I will return to my mother tongue for the moment to ensure everybody understands what I am saying.

Vote 40, in my estimation, in fact in any objective person's estimation, is a clear and direct step toward transparency. It is a clear and direct step toward openness. It is a fundamental step toward the ultimate goal which we all share. I hope we can all agree to make Canadians aware of where their taxpayers are going. This is important not only for that process. I am sure my friends on either side of the aisle would agree that once Canadians know where their taxpayer dollars are going, they will share my conclusion that they are getting value for their dollars, and that this Canadian government serves all Canadians well.

We will do so during the estimates process, during the budget process, and throughout the year. I urge everyone to support vote 40.

Mr. Tom Lukiwski: Mr. Speaker, I think if you seek it, you will find unanimous consent to allow my colleague opposite an additional 10 minutes.

An hon. member: No.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): I am afraid we do not have consent. Questions and comments, the hon. member for Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan.

Mr. Garnett Genuis (Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the member spoke about how I and other members might use their office budgets. I think after that speech, we are certainly very interested in an itemized listing of how that member uses his hospitality budgets. We will look forward to that in due course. Maybe we already have some idea.

However, I want to ask the member for his views on the carbon tax. Canadians across the country, and in my riding in particular, want to know how much the carbon tax will cost the average family, how much they will have to pay for it. We have a government that is proceeding in a very secretive way.

The member spoke admiringly of Australians. They used to have a carbon tax and they got rid of it. They tried that, realized it did not work, and they got rid of it. Will he follow the good example of the Australians, about whom he has already spoken? Will he follow the example of previous Canadian governments? Will he oppose the carbon tax, or at the very least tell us how much it costs?

● (2025)

Mr. Kyle Peterson: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the banter with my good friend from across the way. We have some good banter in this place, and it is always in good humour, as he knows and appreciates.

The 2009 throne speech actually called for a cap and trade. We all remember that. I do not think we were the government then. I find it interesting when we are talking about climate change, the carbon tax, and different things on that issue. However, I find it completely interesting when we look at the last leadership convention and the Conservative leadership choice. The only leadership candidate who believed in climate change got 9% of the vote and the leadership candidate who wanted to dismantle supply management got 49% of the vote.

We need look no further. If people do not believe in climate change, they will always have trouble with any price on carbon. That is the fact, unfortunately.

Mr. Randall Garrison (Esquimalt—Saanich—Sooke, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for his speech, although it bore a great resemblance to a long string of heckles.

The member talked about $7 billion, which does not have any real purpose in the budget. I happened to sit in in the government operations committee, so I would have to disagree with him. Very serious questions were asked. We asked officials what it really meant if we voted for $7 billion now? The officials said we could ask questions about it later.

That is not the way it is supposed to work in Parliament. We are asked to approve measures. We know what they are and we vote for or against them based on what is going to happen.

The member's analogy with the members' office budgets proves he has not looked very closely at his own budget. Our budgets are itemized. We know what the dollars are are for. We know what we can spend them on.

I would ask the member to think again about this request in the budget for members of Parliament to give a blank cheque of $7 billion to Liberals and only ask about it later.

Mr. Kyle Peterson: Mr. Speaker, the member for Esquimalt—Saanich—Sooke did stand in one day on our government operations committee. I used to think we had the best committee on the Hill, but the day he showed up, I realized it could be so much better. He was like a bright light on the committee, and it was awesome.

However, since that time, we have invited 12 departments to committee to ask questions. My friend from Edmonton West moved a motion, and we agreed to it, that brought 12 departments in front of the committee to follow up on the request the member made earlier in the committee. It was an important part of the process, and I agree.

My comment toward the member's office budget is that we get an envelope of dollars for each sort of section and group, and that is exactly what vote 40 does. It gives an envelope to the departments to spend the money. They have to account for it after it is spent. It has to come back to Parliament. Every month, they will be reporting to the House. It is not a blank cheque.

First, my idea of blank cheque is one that does not have a number on it. This one clearly has a number. I do not see where the blank cheque analogy comes from. Every dime has to be accounted for. Departments have to report back to the House. The Treasury Board president, who is doing yeoman's service on this file, has said that they will report back every year. He has done enough that the PBO has agreed that this meets any test of accountability and transparency.

If it is good enough for the Auditor General, if it is good enough for PBO, I do not know why it is not good enough for the opposition.

Ms. Rachael Harder (Lethbridge, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I will be sharing my time with the hon. member for Sturgeon River—Parkland.

Today, I have the privilege of talking about the main estimates. To some, this might sound rather boring; to others, they might not even know what the estimates are; and still to others, they know exactly what they are and get really excited about it.

What exactly are the estimates? Essentially, it is a financial plan put out by the government. It shows its priorities for the next year. Specifically, it casts a vision, but the vision is cast in numbers, really big numbers, lots of spending. As the opposition, it is our responsibility to look through these numbers and decide whether the government's spending is actually in the best interest of Canadians. Then we come before this place and we are able to put forward arguments with regard to whether those numbers are in fact in the best interest of Canadians.

Why should Canadians care? Canadians should care because governments do not have their own money. Governments spend Canadians' money. It is called "taxes". At the end of the day, when we are talking about the estimates, talking about spending, and looking at these massive numbers, we are talking about the money Canadians have worked really hard for.

The Liberal government is spending a lot of it, a ton of money. It is money it does not have, a good portion of it anyway, so it is fair to say that when it is spending this money it is actually driving us further into deficit as a country. Now, there are only two ways a country can make money. One, it can develop the natural resources it has at its disposal. For example, building a pipeline and getting a commodity to market would produce money. The other way that a country can produce money is by taxing people directly through income tax, a gasoline tax, or through other sorts of taxation, a carbon tax, perhaps. We will get to that in just a moment.

While a Conservative government believes in giving priority to the development of natural resources, expanding trade, and developing international relationships, the Liberal government has actually chosen to increase taxation and incur a giant deficit while not fostering relationships with other countries, not making sure our commodities are able to get to market, nor ensuring we are attracting investors to Canada. The problem with this way of governing is that it makes life incredibly expensive for everyday Canadians.

This budget, and therefore the estimates, could have been great. It could have cast a really great forecast across the country, a really great vision for our country. We had a lot of potential going for us. When the Liberals came into power, they had a world economy thriving all around them. Interests rates were low. The Canadian dollar was down, which facilitated trade, and entrepreneurs were creating jobs and were invested in our country, at least they were until recently. Now they have decided to pick up and go because there is a carbon tax being implemented. Those things were positive and created potential for us as a country to do incredible things.

With that, a responsible government would take advantage of this economic stature and take the additional money it could generate during this time and put it aside for when the country falls upon hard economic times and it is needed. Instead, the government is choosing to spend an additional $18 billion it does not have, which means it is an $18-billion deficit. There is absolutely no requirement to do this; the government is just doing it.

I have looked through the estimates and the budget, and I have tried to find what is so great about this that the government needed the extra $18 billion. I just cannot find it. The government will try to tell us it needs it in part, a significant part it says, for infrastructure, because infrastructure helps build our economy, helps invest in our nation, and make it a viable place for further investment from other businessmen and women.

The problem with this is that when we look at the numbers in the estimates, what we see is that infrastructure spending has been cut by $2.1 billion here and $35 billion has been given to a foreign investment bank, namely China. We are investing in its infrastructure, but we are not investing in Canada's infrastructure. How will this help Canadians? It will not.

Let us look at some other things. The government is creating a $7-billion slush fund without telling us where that money is going. There is no accountability and no transparency.

● (2030)

The government is also taking $4.5 billion and putting it toward a pipeline. It did not need to put it toward this pipeline. The pipeline was going to go forward based on private money. However, the government ragged the puck. It put incredible regulatory measures in place. It withheld its support from Kinder Morgan, and at the end of the day, it had to swoop in and buy this pipeline. Members might be thinking that $4.5 billion does not seem like that much and is a pretty good deal. It is not, because this pipeline is only worth about $2 billion. Therefore, we are paying $4.5 billion for a pipeline that is worth $2 billion, and we did not even need to spend a dime on it because it would have been built based on private money from Kinder Morgan.

In addition to that, we could talk about the veterans. The Prime Minister was recently at a town hall where he was asked why he was not investing more money into veterans. He had the audacity to say to these wounded veterans that we just do not have the money right now. The government has $7 billion for a slush fund, $35 billion for China, $4.5 billion for a pipeline that the government did not need to purchase because it was going to go into the ground if the government would have just let it, yet it does not have money for veterans.

At a time when the government should be focused on making life more affordable for Canadians by getting out of the way, it is focusing on implementing more regulations and slamming Canadians with more taxes. The current Prime Minister is failing Canadian families over and over again.

Recently, there was an Ipsos Reid poll that came out in December. It said that about half of Canadian families are within $200 a month of not being able to pay their household bills. That is a very slim margin. If their expenses go up by $200, they will no longer be able to pay their bills. That is a big deal. It is especially a big deal when we have a federal government in place that is trying to implement a carbon tax, which will definitely boost the household debt load.

Let us talk about that carbon tax. We are not talking about a little tax. We are talking about a big tax. We are talking about a tax on everything. We are talking about a tax that is going to be imposed on home heating, fuel, and electricity. Anything that requires fossil fuels in order to get it to market or in its production will be taxed. We are talking about clothing, shoes, food, and camping equipment. All of that will have a tax applied to it. Not only that, but the GST will also have a tax applied to it.

Albertans have been paying a carbon tax since January 1, 2017. I thought that I would do a little survey with those in my riding and ask them if the carbon tax has changed their behaviour, because that is the theory, that it will somehow change people's consumption patterns. I asked a few questions in this survey. I asked if people did not need to heat their homes in winter, if they no longer needed to drive to work on a consistent basis, if they stopped buying groceries, if they no longer required corrective lenses in order to see, if their children no longer needed to be driven to sports practices, if they started to walk their household garbage and recycling to their respective places instead of using curbside pickup, and if they started their own cotton farm and sewed their own clothes. I even asked my farmers if they reverted to using a plow. I did not get a single positive response. We are shocked. We would expect the carbon tax to change these behaviours. However, it has not. It is an absolute joke. It is simply a tax that the current government is imposing on every single Canadian. It will do nothing to reduce greenhouse gases, as proven by B.C., and it will do nothing to change our behaviours and our consumption patterns.

We rely on fossil fuels to live everyday life. That needs to be acknowledged in this place as a fact. To pretend that it is not so is absolutely ignorant of the government. Therefore, with regard to this carbon tax, I would call upon the government to back off and put measures in place that are supportive of Canadian families instead of harmful. A government's responsibility is to look out for the well-being of its citizens, to provide an environment where they can prosper, where their dreams can be made into reality, where they can thrive. I call upon the government to create that environment, because that is the Canada that every single Canadian from coast to coast deserves.

● (2035)

Hon. Larry Bagnell (Yukon, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Conservative Party's constitution lists, "A belief that the quality of the environment is a vital part of our heritage to be protected by each generation for the next." That is one of its guiding principles.

Why then is the Conservative Party against taking action to address climate change?

● (2040)

Ms. Rachael Harder: Mr. Speaker, I am not sure if the hon. member has asked his constituents what impact the carbon tax is having on them, if it has changed their behaviour in any way. Perhaps his results are different from mine.

I have talked to my constituents. I have talked to people in B.C. Let us talk about B.C. for a moment. B.C. has had a carbon tax since 2008, the longest standing carbon tax in Canada. One might be curious to know how much of its greenhouse gas has been reduced, because surely with a carbon tax in place since 2008, it must be significant. B.C. must be seeing incredible gains. At least at the bare minimum, their farmers are reverting to plows, right? Actually, B.C.'s greenhouse gas emissions are going up. It has had a carbon tax since 2008 and its greenhouse gas emissions are going up.

Is a carbon tax the best way to defeat climate change?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Pierre Nantel (Longueuil—Saint-Hubert, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague for her speech.

In good faith and with all due respect, I have a very simple question. What would the Conservative Party propose instead of the carbon tax?

[*English*]

Ms. Rachael Harder: That is easy, Mr. Speaker. We are a party that believes in the potential of every single woman and man across this country. We believe in their freedom. We believe that fewer regulations are better and that less taxation is better. We believe in supporting families and helping them thrive. We believe in affordability.

We want Canadian families to be able to make end's meet. We want them to do the things they need to do in order to contribute to Canadian society so we can all benefit. That is the kind of country we want to live in. We want to live in a prosperous country. We want to live in a country with a vibrant future, a country that invests in our next generation and leaves this country better for those to come than what we have experienced.

If that is the country we want, then we need to make sure we take away red tape. We need to make sure that we allow people to work for a dollar and it means a dollar. We need to make sure that we are giving people the opportunity to buy houses and cars because they have the means to do so, to invest in their children's education because they have the means to do so. Forcing people to live in poverty is not an option. That is not a good economic plan and it certainly is not a good environmental plan.

Mr. Ziad Aboultaif (Edmonton Manning, CPC): Mr. Speaker, let me tell the House a story of the Liberal government. It invites us to lunch, makes us pay for that lunch, and then it takes the receipt and claims the expense.

It seems like the Liberal government has a problem with definitions. It seems like the Liberals have a problem with transparency. Will the hon. member help the government define transparency?

Ms. Rachael Harder: Mr. Speaker, I am not allowed to pick up the glass behind me but it does have water in it. It is transparent, which means I can see into it and all that is in the glass.

If the government wishes to be transparent with Canadians, then it should allow Canadians to see the decisions they are making and the impact that those decisions will have on them.

For example, with regard to the carbon tax, we in the official opposition have requested an important document. That document will tell us how much Canadians will pay for this carbon tax that the government is imposing on them. What has the government done? It has withheld that information. It gave us a sheet of paper and made a mockery out of us by blacking it out and saying, "Here is your information." That is not transparency. That is incredibly disrespectful to every single taxpayer across this country.

Mr. Dane Lloyd (Sturgeon River—Parkland, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to rise today in the House of Commons. I have been here for about six months now, and every single day, it is such a privilege and honour to be here with members of all parties. I think we are all here for the right reasons. We want to serve Canadians to the best of our ability and in the best interest of our constituents. Sometimes we have different ideas of what is best for our constituents, but I know that in our hearts, we all want to do what is right.

I rise to speak on the issue of the main estimates and the Liberal government's extraordinary use of vote 40 to circumvent parliamentary oversight and accountability. We are debating this today because of how uncommon the circumstances are surrounding these estimates. For the first time, outside of a major economic crisis, the government is using measures to spend over $7 billion with little parliamentary oversight. The Liberals are claiming that they are doing this to improve accountability and transparency, but outside of their own echo chamber, and outside of the musings of some mandarins, there is little to substantiate those claims.

For those of you watching at home, I would like to outline the importance of the main estimates and their role in the budget process. Main estimates are a tool used by the government to allocate funds from Treasury Board to various departments based upon the estimated amount of funds needed to achieve the government's policy goals. Sometimes these estimates fall short, and supplementary estimates are used to allocate further funds. This is usually done because of unforseen circumstances, such as a natural disaster or an economic catastrophe, such as the 2008 recession.

Estimates are also an essential tool for parliamentarians to hold government accountable, because they provide the means by which we measure government spending and also hold it to its commitments, should the spending go higher than estimated or should the government fall short of its commitments.

Recently, one of the most important debates regarding the main estimates has been taking place in this chamber and has also been taking place in some committees, although we have seen the government unwilling to engage in debate or even in talks about this matter at committee. I am specifically talking about vote 40.

Vote 40, according to the Parliamentary Budget Officer, is a novel innovation by the government. A similar measure was used most recently during the 2009 recession as an extraordinary means to get critical funding out the door. At the time, in the face of a rapidly deteriorating economy, government stimulus was needed to protect jobs. The fact that this was such an extraordinary circumstance justified the use of this measure. However, it has not been used for day-to-day purposes until the current government decided to use it. Today the Liberal government, ostensibly in its effort to streamline the budget process, has decided to use this measure, but in reality, it will reduce accountability and transparency.

To get to the crux of the matter, the Liberal government is voting to allocate over $7 billion without telling Canadians or parliamentarians what that money will be spent on. In recent committee testimony, many departments that came before the committee were unable to explain what the monies they were receiving in the vote would be used for. In some cases, individual departments are being allocated hundreds of millions of dollars and cannot even explain what the plans are to spend that money.

This is not chump change. This is hundreds of millions of dollars of taxpayer resources that could be going toward paying down mortgages, paying for children's education, or saving for retirement.

Canadians expect that when they pay taxes, they can trust that the government will spend on things that are important to taxpayers, and most importantly, that there is transparency regarding what those things are and what the outcomes of those things will be. Canadians do not write blank cheques to the government, and they certainly do not want to give the Treasury Board Secretariat, which is a department that most Canadians know very little about, the authority to spend money without Parliament's oversight.

My constituents in Sturgeon River—Parkland, like most normal Canadians, do not want to spend their time thinking about the nuances of Treasury Board submissions or funding guidelines, but they rightfully expect me, as their member of Parliament, to care about these things on their behalf. They expect me to hold the government accountable, whether my party is in government or in opposition, to ensure that those funds are spent in a way that is measurable, transparent, and fundamentally subject to parliamentary oversight.

We cannot take this issue lightly. The actions of Parliament today set the precedent for Parliament in the future. By going down this route today, the government is opening the floodgates that will erode some of the means by which parliamentarians, and indeed Canadians, can hold their government to account.

● (2045)

In case some back home are wondering if this is not just something that their Conservative member of Parliament is blowing out of proportion, I want to direct them to comments made by the Parliamentary Budget Officer, who is a non-partisan official, and whose mandate is to scrutinize the government and its actions. In regard to vote 40, in his own words he says, "With the money requested for TB Vote 40, TBS is effectively requesting that Parliament provide funding in advance of this scrutiny".

Drawing some historical parallels, in the 17th century, the king of England, King Charles I sought to spend money without parliamentary oversight. He refused to even allow Parliament to convene when they would not give him what he wanted. It led to civil war, and as a consequence of Parliament winning that civil war, we gained the privileges in the Westminster system that we have today. One of those privileges is, chiefly, the right of oversight over government spending decisions.

What the government has labelled as reform may help the government get the money out the door faster, but it is undermining accountability and transparency in its efforts to do so, and that is not a trade-off my constituents are willing to make. It is not a trade-off I am willing to make. In fact, much of the information surrounding this spending will not be available until after the next election, effectively giving the government what many of my colleagues have called a slush fund to spend on whatever it may want before the next election, with little oversight for us as parliamentarians or for Canadians. In effect, it is going to be denying Canadians the evidence they need to render a verdict on the government until after the next election.

How are Canadians to know, especially when we are talking about deficits that were supposed to be $10 billion and are now $20 billion. Going year after year, how are we supposed to get a sense of what the value is for those monies when the government has now been setting a precedent through vote 40 to spend $7 billion without government oversight. How are Canadians supposed to have that accountability?

I also know that the Auditor General is very concerned, in a much more general manner. In a recent document and report he outlined his concerns with the government's spending plans. To paraphrase, he said that with this government the measure of success has become the amount of money spent, rather than approved outcomes. This is a damning assessment from the Auditor General that casts doubt on whether taxpayers' resources are being used in the best manner by the government. Instead, it looks like they are just trying to shovel it out the door as if it is a virtue to spend taxpayers' money, rather than spending it for the best possible result for Canadians.

In committee, my colleague, the member for Edmonton West, has been holding the government's feet to the fire to try to get some transparency over the $7 billion appropriation. The government is playing a game of ping pong with the opposition, telling them to ask departmental officials what the individual funds are allocated for. However, when those departmental officials are asked, they claim it would be preposterous for them to know what the money is going to be used for. This level of stonewalling occurring on this measure is truly astounding, and for the government to so frivolously administer taxpayer funds is truly disturbing.

It is troubling, the Orwellian Newspeak coming out of the government. When Conservatives ask how much the carbon tax will cost Canadians, the Liberals claim the information is out there, but when we ask for the information in an access to information request, they black out the document to hide the true cost to Canadians families.

Day after day we ask, and day after day they refuse to answer. We also see that the government increasingly wants to move its spending off the books, so that Canadians do not get to see how it is spent. They are trying to interfere with the Canada pension plan, our national retirement savings, to bail out the government's disastrous intervention on the Kinder Morgan pipeline, an intervention that would not be necessary at all if the government had just stood up for the energy industry and unequivocally backed the pipeline in the national interest, instead of standing back and letting the project fall apart under its watch.

The Liberals have also created this new infrastructure bank, and they are shifting resources that could have been used for infrastructure in communities to the bank, so that it reduces transparency.

Finally, to what we are talking about today, vote 40, where the Liberals claim they want to improve accountability and transparency, they are actually removing parliamentary oversight and asking taxpayers to trust that the government knows best.

My constituents demand better from the government. They demand transparency and accountability on how the Liberal government is spending their money. I look forward to spending tonight voting to hold the government accountable for its carbon tax cover-up. I look forward to the months to come, where I will continue to fight for my constituents to hold the government accountable.

● (2050)

Mr. Adam Vaughan (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Families, Children and Social Development (Housing and Urban Affairs), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, throughout the day, I have been hearing references to Australia, which is a country I know well as my parents were born there and it is the place where my cousins live. Email is a fantastic thing because I get to ask them in real time about what happened after carbon pricing was removed in Australia.

My cousins in Victoria will tell us that electricity prices tripled the first year it was gone because the price on coal was removed. The price on coal, which is largely exported to China, was being used to subsidize electricity in Australia for clean energy. When the carbon price was removed, it opened up the coal mines, which was not good for the environment but also tripled the price of electricity.

For those who are really concerned about what the cost of gasoline is in Australia, they might want to check what happened with the gasoline prices there. At the point of the carbon tax being in place, gasoline was going for $1 a litre in Australia. Today it is $1.88 a litre. Why? Because the private market dictates the price, not government taxes. It is the market price for fuel that is the issue.

The trouble in Australia is that it is losing port capacity because of erosion, due to massive floods caused by climate change. Climate change has eroded the Australians' capacity to import cheap energy and so energy prices are going up.

If the members opposite really want to follow Australia's example, could they explain why farmers should pay $1.88 for a litre of gasoline? Could they explain why coal in manufacturing is the preferred method of energy generation? Could they please explain why they want to triple the price of electricity?

● (2055)

Mr. Dane Lloyd: Mr. Speaker, I always enjoy questions from my hon. colleague across the floor. Only a Liberal would argue that by cutting taxes, they are going to increase costs on Canadians. It is absolutely preposterous.

When we are talking about Australia, we should note that in Australia the vast majority of coal used in there is metallurgical coal, which is used in steelmaking, which is shipped to China. We are not talking about coal from coal-fired power plants.

When the member talks about removing a carbon tax and increasing the cost of fuel for people in Australia, the evidence does not match up.

Australia, unlike Canada, is not a largely oil and gas producing country. It is a completely different economy, and it is captive to the countries from which it needs to import oil and gas. We should be looking at why those reasons are causing its increases, not transporting them to Canada and trying to say that raising taxes on Canadians is going to lower our cost of living.

Mr. Randall Garrison (Esquimalt—Saanich—Sooke, NDP): Mr. Speaker, my problem with the arguments the hon. member makes about carbon pricing are similar to those that were just raised by the hon. member from the other side. He is focusing on the upfront costs, but he is skipping what happens if we do not take effective action on climate change.

When we look around British Columbia, where I am from, we see the families that are bearing extreme costs from flooding, families that can no longer get insurance because floods have become more and more frequent because of climate change. We see those who have lost their homes due to forest fires, which are becoming evermore fierce and evermore frequent.

Therefore, I really cannot understand this obsessive focus on the front-end cost here, which completely ignores the massive costs to families and to our society of ignoring climate change.

Mr. Dane Lloyd: Mr. Speaker, today I came here to talk about the main estimates and how the government was trying to pull off a new measure in order to hide the $7 billion in spending. However, the member for Esquimalt—Saanich—Sooke asked a very important question on carbon pricing and the effects of climate change, which we do know have a significant effect on the world.

However, where we fundamentally disagree is when we have policies that are putting a tax on everyday Canadians, on everything from their groceries to their fuel. My colleague said earlier that $200 was what separated many families from being able to make their payments.

As a country, we really need to look for technological solutions. A Saudi prince once said many years ago that the stone age did not end because of a lack of stones. The oil age is not going to end because of a lack of oil. It is going to change because of technology. We need to be looking there for the solutions, not taxes on Canadians.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it has been an interesting day to say the least. We have heard the Conservatives talk a great deal about taxation. They talk a lot about revenue, among a few other things. I was hoping to take this opportunity to share with my friends across the way a few thoughts, maybe introduce a few facts, and see if they could realize some of the errors in their ways and possibly reflect on the reality of the situation.

Where to start? The Conservatives continuously try to push a myth. The Government of Canada has been very strong in terms of good sound environmental policy. We have witnessed that virtually since day one, when the Prime Minister went to Paris with a number of different stakeholders, including provinces, indigenous peoples, and others. He came back as the signatory to a fantastic agreement, which was actually being acted upon around the world. At the time, we had countries all around the world recognizing that we do need to put a price on pollution.

Then the Prime Minister and cabinet focused on getting provinces together to have a discussion. It was an historical agreement that we needed to look at the environment and look at a price on pollution. It should not be of any great surprise, in fact well over 80% of Canadians already have a system in place where there is a price on pollution.

This gets us right to that whole issue of a myth that the Conservatives are trying to say exists today. It is as if there is going to be this super-huge tax coming between now and 2019, and whether it is true or not, it does not really matter because the Conservatives are going to say it is true. They want to plant the seeds of doubt and fear in Canadians.

Truth be known, when it comes to taxation, the government has nothing to learn from members opposite. In reality, we just need to look at the actions of the Conservative Party since the last federal election. Those who might be following the debate would be very much aware that one of the very first initiatives of the government was a substantial tax break for Canada's middle class. There is absolutely no doubt about that. There was a clear tax break, at the same time there was, in fairness, a tax increase to Canada's wealthiest 1%.

The Conservative Party voted against that. On the one hand, Conservatives are saying, "Look out, Canadians, the Government of Canada wants to impose a tax." In fact, that is not the case. In reality, it is the Conservatives who voted against a tax decrease to Canada's middle class.

I listened to hours of Conservative after Conservative standing up and clearly demonstrating that they are in fact completely out of touch. They are not listening to what Canadians expect from good government, a government that will demonstrate leadership on important files. The price on pollution is one of those issues that the government takes very seriously.

It was interesting. I heard one member from the Conservative Party talk about the importance of revenue. She made reference to the fact that we develop natural resources or we raise taxes, or we increase the deficit. Those are the three things she focused on. We have heard a lot coming from the members opposite. I can comment on each and every one of those separately, but there was one that she missed out on, growing the economy.

The government, working with Canadians in all regions of our nation, has witnessed some of the greatest growth in terms of real jobs. We are talking in excess of 600,000, most of which are full-time jobs that have been created as a direct result of Canadians working with the government to ensure that every region has seen a benefit, in a very real and tangible way.

● (2100)

If we grow the economy, we also grow the revenue of the government, and that is something the Conservatives have completely forgotten.

If there is an area in which Stephen Harper demonstrated failure, it is dealing with development in the prairie provinces. I could come up with a number of examples, but one example that has often been referred to today and in the past number of days is the issue of natural resources, in particular the Trans Mountain expansion.

One would think that the Conservative Party would have been happy when the Government of Canada made the decision to acquire assets so that we could move forward with a pipeline to tidewater. For months, they were asking where the pipeline was, and to show them the pipeline. Stephen Harper failed at delivering. Not one inch of pipeline to tidewater was built under his government in 10 years. In two and a half years, we have put in place an opportunity that will see a pipeline to tidewater actually built. I believe everyone in the Prairies will recognize that.

The Conservatives are nervous about this and say that we spent public money on the issue. Why did Stephen Harper invest in the automobile industry when it looked like it was not going to survive? He did that because it was in the national interest to do so. The Conservatives spent billions and billions on the automobile industry, a lot more than we will be spending on the Trans Mountain expansion, with no reservations. We recognize that as a positive thing.

Today, the hundreds of thousands of jobs we have in the automobile industry might not have been here if the government had not become involved. That means the Conservative Party can be brought into doing the right thing at times. It can be a challenge to drag the Conservatives into doing something that is right. In the back rooms, they would probably concede that the government acquiring the assets of the pipeline is a good thing, but they cannot say that publicly. Shame on them for not recognizing that the national interest and Alberta are worth it.

If they are prepared to fight for the automobile industry in the national interest, they should have been prepared to fight for Canada getting involved and investing in a national pipeline. However, every one of the Conservative members of Parliament from Alberta did nothing but criticize this government consistently throughout. At least there are some Albertan MPs on the government benches that recognize the true value in terms of what is happening here.

We can contrast that with my NDP friends, who have made it very clear. Rachel Notley, the NDP Premier of Alberta, understands, as this government does, that when it comes to the environment and the economy, they go hand in hand. We have heard the government talk about that now for over two years, and the pipeline is an excellent example of this. Like NDP Premier Rachel Notley, we believe that the Trans Mountain expansion is in the best interest of our nation.

● (2105)

The NDP, on the other hand, at the national level here in Ottawa said no. Let there be no doubt that they are, in my opinion, completely abandoning the province of Alberta, and I would argue beyond Alberta to include the Prairies. They are abandoning what is in the national interest. That is shameful. If they cannot support this particular pipeline, then what pipeline can they support? They do not support any pipeline. They are trying to out-green the Green Party. They believe there is no need for a pipeline.

I come from Manitoba, which is a beautiful province. We have unfortunately been in a position where we have been receiving literally billions of dollars every year through equalization payments. Contrast that to Alberta. Alberta generates on the positive side billions of dollars every year.

What is the difference between Manitoba and Alberta? Many of my constituents would say that Alberta was somewhat blessed by having a lot of oil. There is no doubt that oil has really been responsible for a lot of the success of Alberta, and it has contributed immensely to the many different social programs. If we did not receive those billions of dollars, we would not be able to provide that quality health care that we have in Manitoba, the type of education we provide, the repairs, and many other wonderful things, including financing environmentally sound projects. The Government of Canada, the provinces, and the different regions have benefited immensely by Alberta and its contributions through equalization payments.

My New Democratic friends want to throw that out the window. NDP Rachel Notley has said that they have a cap. They are being very responsible with respect to the environment. That is something we have recognized. Even the New Democrats will say Rachel Notley is being wonderful and she is abiding by emissions and she has this cap. The only thing that they disagree with her about is that she wants the pipeline. However, the pipeline is all part of the Rachel Notley package. One cannot cherry-pick and say that the pipeline is a bad idea to Rachel Notley or to the NDP in Alberta. They will never agree to that. Only the national New Democrats will agree, and team up with the B.C. New Democrats.

I find that the New Democrats are making a big mistake. We will see that once we get the pipeline moving forward and the jobs being created, and the potential for ongoing revenues, all in an environmentally sound way that incorporates different levels of government, indigenous peoples, and many other stakeholders. That is in regard to that source of revenue. In terms of natural resources, that was often referred to.

One never runs out of incidences of hypocrisy within the collective Conservative caucus when it comes to the issue of deficits. Imagine that we have the Conservative Party of Canada trying to give advice on what is good or bad when it comes to deficit financing. Let me expand as to why I say that. When Stephen Harper actually became the prime minister of Canada, he inherited a multi-billion dollar surplus. Even before the recession started in Canada, not only did he blow the surplus, he created another deficit.

● (2110)

It was a whopper of a deficit. It was a multi-billion dollar deficit. It took him no time whatsoever to do that. My friend across the way says we told him to spend more. Have I got news for him. Saying the Liberals told him to do it does not cut it with Canadians. The Conservatives are the ones who turned a multi-billion dollar surplus into a multi-billion dollar deficit in a year. Then, they continued to add billions of dollars to it.

We have heard the Conservatives say they want to see a balanced budget within four years. They could not do it. In budget after budget, and I could say that nine or 10 times, they kept on adding to the deficit. The total was over $170 billion of Conservative debt.

Then when they tried to get it to balance, what did they do? I told members about their purchase of GM shares. They tried to sell $1 billion of GM shares to try to cover their back ends, to try to give the false impression that they know how to balance a budget 10 years later. It is a stretch.

I am hoping that those listening, and Canadians, will understand that when it comes to the balancing of a budget, or the managing of an economy, or dealing with important issues related to the environment, this government understands what Canadians expect of it. We have a Prime Minister who consistently says within his caucus that as members of Parliament, we are to bring our concerns from the constituencies we represent to Ottawa, and build the types of budgets and support programs that we believe Canadians expect of good governance. That is, in fact, what we have witnessed, budget after budget, with respect to Liberal budgets. I believe that Canadians are quite satisfied with the priorities this government has.

I made reference to the number of jobs. We created 600,000-plus jobs over two years. We believe in Canada's middle class. Canada's middle class is our number one priority, and that predates the Prime Minister becoming prime minister. When he was elected the leader of the Liberal Party, one of the very first statements he made was about getting behind Canada's middle class and supporting it, and supporting those who are aspiring to be a part of it. That has been priority one with this government from day one, and it will continue to be a priority of this government. If we invest in Canada's middle class, ultimately we are going to have a healthier economy. It is the middle class, and those aspiring to be a part of it, that push the economy.

Let me give members a specific example. Every month, millions of dollars goes into Winnipeg North, the riding I represent, through two programs that have been greatly enhanced by this government. One is the Canada child benefit and the other is the guaranteed income for seniors. These programs lifted hundreds of seniors and children out of poverty in Winnipeg North, and the same principle applies across this country.

Those individuals are consumers, and they are participating in the economy. They are helping to create the jobs that ultimately led this government, working with Canadians, to generate over 600,000 jobs. The Conservative Party votes against every progressive initiative, whether it is increasing funding to Canada's poorest seniors or supporting the children in our communities or giving tax breaks to Canada's middle class or giving the 1% a tax hike. It is never-ending.

● (2115)

The Conservatives will consistently find a way to be critical and to oppose. They make a darn good opposition. We hope to keep them there for many years.

The Deputy Speaker: I am gauging a great degree of interest in participating in questions and comments. Therefore, I will ask hon. members to keep their questions and comments concise so we can get as many in as we can.

The hon. member for Durham.

Hon. Erin O'Toole (Durham, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I love responding to my friend, the deputy House leader for the Liberals. I normally start off by reminding him that the omnibus budget implementation bill that is related to a lot of the debate tonight is something that he used to call an assault on democracy in all those old quotes. However, his speech was so interesting that I am not going to talk about his old chestnuts from when he was in opposition. I am going to compare how he talks about the NDP of Rachel Notley, their ideological friends, as opposed to the NDP's NDP in B.C.

It is interesting to see how far the mighty Liberal Party of Canada has gone on the spectrum. The Liberals are now left. He is admitting it. He was referring to his NDP friend as "Rachel" in the House. I would refer to her as Premier Notley. I think that is the respect she deserves. However, they are so far left, they are now comparing their left allies against the NDP's NDP.

Who are the member's favourite people on the left? Is it his friend Rachel in the NDP in Alberta, or is it the NDP from B.C.?

● (2120)

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, the truth of the matter is that we support good governance, and where there are good decisions being made, we can get behind them. Premier Notley, to make my friend happy, is doing a fantastic job with respect to the economy and the environment. As premier, she gets it, as the Prime Minister does. She recognizes that it is not only in Alberta's best interest but is in Canada's best interest. It is only the national NDP that has conceded the national best interest.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gabriel Ste-Marie (Joliette, QD): Mr. Speaker, I would like my colleague to know that what I like about my Conservative friends is that at least they are honest. Some of them said earlier that they believe climate change is not caused by humans, but a side effect of human activity. That is why they think they can go on extracting oil, western Canada's dirty oil, even if it causes terrible, negative consequences, since they do not acknowledge them. They think that since oil makes money, they should continue to drill and develop this resource.

I strongly disagree with the claim made by the government and the Liberal Party that it is possible to protect the environment and grow the economy at the same time. My colleague said that in his speech. Unfortunately, that is incorrect. It is just not true that we can pollute shamelessly as long as we rake in as much money as possible and use part of it to clean up the pollution. That is not how it works.

The American academic Jeffrey D. Sachs from Columbia University said that the government lost all international credibility on climate change when it decided to buy what my colleague referred to as a pipeline in the national interest or national pipeline, even though the Prime Minister spoke of creating a postnational state.

I would like to hear my colleague's thoughts on that.

[*English*]

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, a very important aspect of this whole debate that needs to be reinforced at times is that through the Trans Mountain expansion, we will see a significant generation of additional revenues, much of which will assist governments, whether it is at the provincial level or the national level. Ultimately, different provinces will also benefit from those additional revenues that will be generated. Many of the initiatives that will be taken will promote and encourage a healthier environment, clean technology, and all sorts of research capabilities. A great deal of money is being spent, and I suspect that a number of those dollars that will flow will come from natural resources.

Mr. Garnett Genuis (Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan, CPC): Mr. Speaker, my friend across the way spoke about good government at the provincial level. If we deliver government at the provincial level like the current government has, apparently we end up being able to hold caucus meetings in a van. That is hopefully where it is headed as well.

He spoke about the middle class and those working hard to join it. The numbers clearly show that the middle class are paying more under the government, and they are not particularly happy about it.

My question about the estimates is with respect to the Parliamentary Budget Officer. I understand that the committee only met twice to look at these different aspects of the votes. Here is what the Parliamentary Budget Officer had to say about the government's approach to the estimates. He stated:

> The Government's approach to funding Budget 2018 initiatives provides parliamentarians with information that only marginally supports their deliberations and places fewer controls around the money it approves.

Here is the thing about the government. It thinks it is doing such a good job, but it always refuses to be forthright with the information. It will not tell us how much the carbon tax costs, and it is coming up with this new secretive way of reporting the numbers. If the government thinks it is doing such a good job, why will it not show the numbers so people know and can decide?

● (2125)

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, I know my friend and colleague was very good friends with Stephen Harper and worked with the old PMO staff in many ways. I am sure he would know Ian Brodie. Ian Brodie was the former chief of staff for Stephen Harper. As opposed to listening to what I have to say about the changes, here is what Ian Brodie has to say. He salutes the changes and believes that they put us on the right track.

If my Conservative friend does not want to believe me, maybe he should believe the former chief of staff of Stephen Harper and recognize that we are on the right track. Canadians are seeing more accountability and transparency with this government. It does not matter what the opposition might try to say. 'ore information is out there than there ever before, and we are on the right track.

Ms. Filomena Tassi (Hamilton West—Ancaster—Dundas, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my friend from Winnipeg North has made a lot of great comments and shared important information. I like his focus on the Liberals really making responsible investments.

In 2011, the NDP filibustered for about 58 hours. An MP on the Conservative side, who now happens to be the opposition House leader, estimated the costs at $50,000 an hour for that extra time. The member for Carleton has now said that the Conservatives will play a game and that game will last approximately 30 hours, which is a cost to Canadian taxpayers of about $1.5 million.

Therefore, I would like to ask the hon. member to comment on what the Conservative game is costing taxpayers this evening, not only with respect to the money but also the time it is taking the MPs away from their constituencies so they can consult with Canadians.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, I understand that it was the current opposition House leader who made the assertion that it was $50,000 an hour so the House could function. Yes, the member is right that this new ploy would cost well over $1 million.

However, we need to understand why the Conservatives are doing this. According to the first speech from the Conservatives today, they are upset because they want to have a better understanding of the costs of the price on pollution, even though they were in government when the report was done. I suspect there might even be a few of the former cabinet ministers who are aware of it. However, if they read the document that was made public back on April 1, there is all sorts of information in there. Maybe they could save the Canadian taxpayers $1.5 million by just doing a little reading and their homework.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Pierre Nantel (Longueuil—Saint-Hubert, NDP): Mr. Speaker, if the government is worried about finding $1.5 million, why not save $4.5 billion by not buying a rusty, leaky pipeline? Does the government not want to save that money?

Obviously, if I were an Albertan working in the oil sands, I would be happy with the Liberals' decision. However, what is so appalling about this situation is that the Liberals were unable to fulfill their role of coordinating between the provinces, so they decided to get out the strap, impose their will, and buy the pipeline.

Is my colleague planning to do the same sort of thing with energy east in Quebec? If so, I will be waiting for him with a strap too.

[*English*]

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, I believe it is important to have good, solid social programming. I like to think that maybe someday we might have a national pharmacare program. I like to believe that we are going to be in a position to continue on with health care accords into the future. I believe that we need to continue to invest in infrastructure. I believe that we need to support our post-secondary education.

What the NDP does not realize is that our natural resources provide a tremendous amount of revenue to the Government of Canada and to our provinces, and it can be done in an environmentally sound way.

We on this side of the House agree with Premier Notley in Alberta when it comes to the Trans Mountain pipeline. It is the responsible way to do it. There has been a lot of consultation with a lot of stakeholders involved. It is in Canada's national best interest. It will be built.

● (2130)

Hon. Peter Kent (Thornhill, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I will be splitting my time with the member for Edmonton West.

Here we are, in the final moments of debate, the penultimate opportunity to speak to the 2018-19 main estimates. I am delighted to have this opportunity. For the benefit of folks looking in from home, the main estimates are supposed to list and outline the resources required by individual departments and agencies for the upcoming fiscal year, in order to deliver the programs for which they are responsible. The main estimates are supposed to be allotments of dollars and cents, many dollars and cents, aligned with specific spending plans, laid out by the government in the budget for the fiscal year.

As we know, budget 2018 was not an economic document. It was a virtue signalling, social engineering, shamelessly pandering, ideologically preoccupied pitch to what one respected national commentator described as "every conceivable Liberal client group and policy cult".

This year, in budget 2018 the government told Canadians that total government revenues this year, taxes primarily, would amount to about $324 billion. Total expenditures by the government and its agencies and departments would be about $339 billion, leaving the budget in a deficit of more than $18 billion. Let us remember, this major deficit is much more than the modest deficits promised by the Liberals, and that their promise of a balanced budget by next year will also be broken, along with so many of their original 2015 campaign promises.

Getting back to the main estimates and how they are supposed to work, the various spending authorities are called "votes" with the amounts to be included in future appropriation bills that Parliament will be asked to approve to enable the government to proceed with its spending plans. That is the way it is supposed to work.

Members may recall the days when finance ministers explained in detail the planned expenditures to Parliament and to Canadians. Not here, there are scores of unknown and undetailed spending elements in the main estimates for 2018-19. That is why so many of my colleagues have shared with the House and Canadians their concern that the Liberals are changing the rules to suit their own suspect agenda.

Is "suspect" too extreme a characterization? I do not think so. After hearing so many opposition speakers, I am sure the Speaker shares our concerns regarding the unacceptable way the Liberals are trying to hide their spending intentions from Canadians. For example, we have the oft-referenced $7.4-billion example. Vote 40, a $7.4-billion vote, is either an attempt to hide next year's election year goodies funding, like the many million dollars dumped into the Quebec riding facing a by-election in just a very days, or it was a very large contingency fund to cover the President of the Treasury Board's unidentified spending priorities, as set by the direction of the Prime Minister and cabinet to avoid parliamentary oversight.

This $7.4 billion has been quite properly characterized by our shadow finance minister, the member for Carleton, as nothing more than a Liberal election-year slush fund. At committee earlier this month, departments that had received major allotments were unable to give meaningful answers about millions of dollars they were to receive or how the spending of those millions will be reported, if ever at all.

Instead, in something of a puppet show, Treasury Board officials stepped in to offer their answers for the department officials who could not. When it came time at that meeting to ask questions about how the mysterious $7.4 billion apparent slush fund would be spent, the Liberal members of committee walked out. Their abandonment of committee killed quorum, leaving those questions unanswered, as they are still unanswered today.

Among the scores of unanswered questions is another glaring question, which was debated in the House earlier today. That question involves the Liberal refusal to tell Canadians just how much the carbon tax obligations they have downloaded on the provinces to collect will cost the average Canadian family.

● (2135)

The Liberals know the answer. They will not tell us, and they will not tell Canadians. They have provided a document that quite clearly focuses on the potential impact of a carbon price on household consumption expenditures, but when the document comes to key findings, there is a blackout. Most segments of the rest of the document are redacted, hidden behind solid ink black blocks.

Members will recall that under our previous Conservative government, Canada worked to reduce greenhouse gas emissions by regulation. Even though Canada generates less than 2%, now far less than 2%, of the world's annual emissions, we acknowledged that we would work with the provinces to carefully reduce emissions while at the same time ensuring that we protected the economy, even as we protected the environment, lines that have since been taken by the Liberal minister and reiterated, by rote, in question period almost every day. As a result, our Conservative government was the first in history to achieve tan$_{g}$ble, significant reductions of greenhouse gases.

We started with the transportation sector, the largest-emitting sector, and we created, in partnership with the United States, tailpipe regulations, which are reducing car and light-truck emissions and will, by 2025, reduce those emissions by 50%, and which will consume 50% less fuel. We set new regulations for heavy-duty trucks and buses that are seeing emissions from these vehicles, by this year, reduced by up to 23%, which means a saving of up to $8,000 a year for a semi-truck operator driving a newly purchased 2018 model vehicle.

We set marine emission guidelines, began work with the aviation and rail sectors, and then moved on to the next-largest emission sector: coal-fired electricity generating plants. We set emission-reduction regulations, and our former Conservative government imposed a ban on the construction of any new coal-fired units, the first government in the world to implement such a ban.

In every one of those emission-reducing regulations, scientists and economists at Environment Canada conducted a cost-benefit study, and in every one of those situations, we were able to show that the benefits of the regulations outweighed the costs. The regulated sectors and the provinces and the consumers knew what careful, reasonable regulation would cost. That is why we are so concerned by the Liberals' refusal to come clean on the estimated cost to the average Canadian family of their carbon tax.

I would like to end with just a couple of statements by past and present parliamentary budget officers. Former PBO, Kevin Page, said, of the unaccounted billions in the main estimates, "Financial control and ministerial accountability are being undermined." He said that of the current government and the main estimates and the budget. Mr. Page said, "This is a new low for our appropriation system."

The current PBO said, "virtually none of the money requested in the new Budget Implementation vote has undergone scrutiny through the standard Treasury Board Submission process." In effect, the current Parliamentary Budget Officer is saying that the government is getting the money through its majority, without proper scrutiny and accountability to this elected House.

Therefore, we in the official opposition will, in the coming many hours, stand so many times, proudly, to oppose the Liberals' unexplained, undocumented, and unaccounted removal of billions of dollars from the national treasury, to be spent in ways that can only be described as highly suspect in the coming election year.

● (2140)

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the member made reference to the price on pollution at the beginning of his comments. Guiding principle No. 18 of the constitution of the Conservative Party states, "A belief that Canada should accept its obligations among the nations of the world." Our government accepted its obligations among the nations of the world by signing the Paris accord.

Why is the Conservative Party going against its own guiding principles on that issue?

Hon. Peter Kent: Mr. Speaker, in the wake of getting rid of the ineffective, unworkable, and unsubscribed Kyoto treaty, which the Liberals signed onto and then they raised emissions by 35%, our government signed the Copenhagen Accord and committed to responsibly balance reducing emissions and protecting our economy, lines which, as I said, have been appropriated by the current environment minister.

As I noted in my speech, and as has been noted by my colleagues any number of times, Canada contributes far less than two per cent of the world's annual global emissions, while China, the largest emitter, has an over-the-horizon commitment to do something someday, while still generating billions of tonnes of carbon into the atmosphere through coal-fired generating stations, which we have banned in this country.

We have balanced what the Liberals claim to balance, and it must be noted that when they went to Paris, they adopted our Copenhagen standards.

Mr. Tom Kmiec (Calgary Shepard, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the just path is always the right one. So goes the Yiddish proverb, which I know the member for Thornhill will thoroughly enjoy. We know that the government is on the unjust path with vote 40 and how it is going to proceed on its spending plans.

The example I give to my constituents to explain what vote 40 means for them is this. I have three kids, and I hope we will be adding a fourth child in August. I have two boys. It would be like my youngest son coming to me and saying, "Dad, I need $20, but instead of me telling you what I am going to spend it on, just give it to my older brother, who will make sure that I spend the $20 wisely."

Does the member think that this is the right way to do things, to allow the Treasury Board to be like the older brother, who really knows how the money is going to be spent without me knowing where that $20 is going?

Hon. Peter Kent: Mr. Speaker, I always enjoy my hon. colleague's introduction of humour and folk stories, very often some with a Yiddish origin. The lesson of the parable of the older brother that he has just reminded us of is a very good analogy to what the President of the Treasury Board is trying to get away with by explaining that the government knows best. It will take money from the national treasury, again with the force of the majority, the tyranny of the majority, and then it will spend that money in ways that will never be fully accounted for.

Mr. John Nater (Perth—Wellington, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I want to give the member for Thornhill the opportunity to talk a little about the mismanagement we are seeing from the Liberals, especially when it comes to the $7-billion slush fund. Does he think the Liberals can actually manage a $7-billion slush fund?

An hon. member: Just watch us.

Hon. Peter Kent: Mr. Speaker, I know the answer came from the other side, "Just watch us." The glaring problem that not only we in the official opposition and the NDP, but all Canadians see is the manner in which the Liberal government disrespected accountability and transparency in committee. A member seemed to celebrate when I made the point that, when questions came around to the $7.4-billion slush fund, the Liberal committee members actually left the committee, killed quorum, and refused to answer questions, which they and the President of the Treasury Board still refuse to answer today.

● (2145)

Mr. Kelly McCauley (Edmonton West, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I hope the Treasury Board president will stand fast for questions.

I am pleased to rise today to speak to the Liberal slush fund, vote 40 of the estimates. I want to quote from King Edward I when he said, "what touches all, should be approved by all, and it is also clear that common dangers should be met by measures agreed upon in common". King Edward originally said this in 1295 when calling the model parliament. At the time, legislative authority was limited primarily to levying taxes. I am sure the current government would love to go back to that era when all parliament did was levy taxes. Edward's goal at the time was to raise funds for the campaign against the Scots and the French, nobel causes I guess, unless one happens to be French or Scottish.

What does this have to do with the budget? Some 753 years ago, King Edward I, in calling the model parliament, set up new functions for spending approvals and addressing grievances. The estimates, with their odious vote 40, violate such long-held functions of what touches all should be approved by all.

What is vote 40? It is basically a slush fund. I will give a quick glossary of some of the items we talked about today. For those watching at home wondering what we are doing, the estimates are basically the spending authority. The budget of course is just an aspirational thing. It is like having a plan to put something together, like perhaps a hockey rink on Parliament Hill, and they might come up with a budget of $8 million. Actually cutting the cheque and paying for it would be in the estimates, which is the spending authority. The public accounts, which I will talk about later, are the books that reconcile all the spending at the end of the year.

I want to read the PBO's letter about the public accounts, because it is important. Not one penny of the spending from the slush fund is going to show up detailed in the public accounts, unlike items such as the hockey rink, or perhaps the $200,000 Twitter account for the health minister. The $7.4 billion will not show up detailed in the public accounts. The Treasury Board president has tried to say otherwise, but the PBO says that currently the main summaries in volume 2, etc. provide dollar amounts to all authorities being transferred from each central vote. The spending data is rolled up and provided as a total number, not detailed, just a lump sum transfer.

There is no accountability for where this money is going to be spent. Why is that? It is basically to cover up the failed actions of the Treasury Board president. He promised us easier understanding of the spending, alignment of the estimates to the budget, and more transparency. We actually got the opposite. We get ministers not coming to committee to defend their spending. We have the Liberal members of the operations committee blocking. We tried repeatedly to add other meetings to have ministers and officials come and explain their spending. We were blocked. We had one extra meeting and Liberal members of OGGO actually walked out, denying us quorum. They had a chance to debate the $7.4 billion. It was the very first item we were debating. They walked out and deprived us the right to actually talk about it.

The voters put us here to approve all that touches us, and the Liberals are trying to stop us. They are the same people who gave us ad scam, the same people who had 10% of their cabinet under ethics investigations. It would have been 13%, but they threw out one of the members, the member for Calgary Centre. The Prime Minister and finance minister have been investigated under ethics. Of course it was not the first finance minister investigated. The current public safety minister, when he was finance minister, was also investigated for ethics.

With all these ethics issues, these are the same people who are saying give us $7 billion of taxpayers' money with no oversight, no plan, and no scrutiny. Remember, not one penny of the $7.4 billion slush fund shows up in any of the departmental plans. Why is that? We were told the plans are not mature. We were told they could not tell us what the money is for in the slush fund because they have not come up with a plan. They have no backup on how they got to the $7.4 billion and what will be spent from the program, but they do want us to preapprove it. they want it to be spent and never seen again. The government's own lauded GC InfoBase, which it claims will show the spending, will only show what the public accounts show. A lump sum transfer will not show details.

In committee, we asked procurement and public services what the details were of the two-thirds of a billion dollars in vote 40. We asked what the money was going to be used for, what results they were hoping to achieve. We were told they were preparing a case to go to Treasury Board, and when they do they will have that information for us. Not now, not in advance, but once they know what they are going to spend it on they will get back to us.

● (2150)

I asked if they had the information now and I was told no.

We asked the procurement minister if she thought that Parliament should rubber-stamp $650 million of taxpayers' money without a plan on how to spend it. When we asked how she even came up with this total, we were told to check with Treasury Board Secretariat. Maybe the Treasury Board president could tell us how he came to that $650 million.

We asked about the $300 million for Phoenix and why there was no breakdown of spending details. I was told it would be presumptuous to put it in the departmental plan when the money had not even been approved by Parliament or by Treasury Board.

We are asked to pre-approve money in vote 40 with zero backup, yet we are told it is presumptuous to expect a budget or details. Imagine going to a bank and saying, "Give me a million-dollar loan." The bank manager asks me what I want it for and I say I am not going to tell. I tell the manager to give me the money and let me spend it, but I will not say what I spent it on. However, I say I will provide a copy of the cancelled cheque to show it was spent.

It is no different with vote 40. We have repeatedly asked what the money is to be used for and the government tells us it does not know. How is this being accountable to taxpayers? How are we going to see what we are getting for the money? We do not know. Not one penny of that is in the departmental plans.

The government goes on and on about trying to provide safe drinking water on reserves. There is $100 million in vote 40, but it does not show up in the government's departmental plans. Not once does it show up as a target on how or what the government is going to achieve with that $100 million.

I asked someone in Treasury Board about the $300 million. I asked for a breakdown, because that money could be used for anything. What is stopping the government from spending that $300 million by providing a thousand dollar payout to every single employee as a reward for putting up with Phoenix? I was told nothing is to stop the government from doing that. The government is actually being sued by the public service. The gentleman from Treasury Board was intimating that perhaps that is what the money was going to be used for. Again we do not know what it is going to be used for.

We asked Privy Council officials about their spending and we were told they could not tell us the details because the money is not approved yet. They do not have a plan as to how that money will be spent. Who is the minister responsible for the Privy Council? It is the Prime Minister. This is a perfect example of what is going on with this department and what the plan is.

We have heard throughout the evening from Liberal members that the Parliamentary Budget Officer supports them. They say the previous Parliamentary Budget Officer supported them. Here is the truth. This is what Kevin Page, the former Parliamentary Budget Officer has to say about the vote 40 slush fund. He said that there was no way that this was an improvement. He did not say it could be okay, or maybe there was some good stuff about it. He said there was no way that this was an improvement.

The PBO says that because not one penny in the slush fund is in the departmental plans, so the estimates and the budget cannot be considered aligned.

The Treasury Board president is taking away accountability and transparency under the guise of making it easier for Canadians to understand because it is now aligned. However, here we have the Parliamentary Budget Officer, who he was happy to quote earlier supporting vote 40, telling us that the Treasury Board president's main reason for taking away accountability has not even achieved real alignment.

I want to finish with a final word from the Parliamentary Budget Officer. He said, "Over the past twenty years, the Executive Branch has gradually ceded additional support and control to Parliament." Perhaps we could go 753 years back to the model Parliament, but Treasury Board vote 40 would represent an inflection point in this trend going the other way, where Parliament would now receive incomplete information and be able to exercise less control. He goes on to say that the main problem, as has been stated before by him and as said by the Treasury Board president, is not the alignment of the estimates; it is the government's inability to get their programs out the door.

He states in his review of the estimates process that parliamentarians have to decide whether it is worth it to allow the government to continue their incompetent way of getting the programs out the door and to allow them a blank check to spend $7.4 billion of taxpayers' money rather than getting their act together.

● (2155)

Hon. Scott Brison (President of the Treasury Board, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to be here tonight to pose a question for my friend and colleague from the Conservative Party. Of course, I would gently remind him that it was the Conservative government that in fact was taken to court by the Parliamentary Budget Office for not sharing information on spending with Parliament. Furthermore, it was the Harper Conservative government, the first government in the history of the British Commonwealth, to be found in contempt of Parliament for not providing the necessary information on government spending to Parliament.

Beyond that, I would refer the member to the measures that are listed very specifically in the estimates in annex 1, which will give him, granularly, the amounts of money being expended, specifically by the department or agency.

I would also give him the opportunity to benefit from the monthly updates on how much money was allocated and how much is remaining, which will be available when he uses a search engine to look at Treasury Board Canada budget implementation vote 2018.

Furthermore, if he looks at the departmental results framework, he will find that in fact this is unprecedented in terms of transparency to Parliament. However, I fear the hon. member would not know the difference between a frozen allotment and a slush fund at this point, having heard his comments tonight—

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Edmonton West.

Mr. Kelly McCauley: Mr. Speaker, I am afraid my colleague would not know the difference between transparency and a black hole.

He mentioned the previous prime minister. I would note that the current Prime Minister is the only prime minister in history to have been charged on ethics and found guilty.

The member suggested looking this up on Google. I would remind the President of the Treasury Board that his own people have said that the lauded GC"s Info will not provide the information on how this money will be spent. It will only show a lump sum.

Before I finish, I want to quote someone from before, who said:

> Mr. Speaker, the Conservatives want a new $3 billion fund with no accountability, no transparency and no oversight. With a deal like that, no wonder [people are]...warning us that money will be wasted.... "This is your money. You have a right to know where it's going and how it's being spent."

That was the Liberal minister from King—Hants.

Mr. Daniel Blaikie (Elmwood—Transcona, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I thank the member for Edmonton West for his work on this file and for being a kind of fellow soldier in this kind of strange journey we have been on in this new territory of budget implementation votes.

One of the things we heard consistently from the government was that it somehow did not matter whether we got information about how it was spending before or after the money was spent. I wonder if the member can tell us what that means from the point of view of holding someone to account?

Mr. Kelly McCauley: Mr. Speaker, my colleague from Elmwood—Transcona has done yeoman's work on trying to hold the government to account and shed some light on this estimates process.

The member is 100% correct. There is zero ability for parliamentarians to hold the government to account.

I will use the $300 million from PSPC. We asked the minister what the money would be used for and to give us details. Was it for hiring more staff? Was it for contracts to IBM? She did not know. We were told that it was preposterous to ask what the money would be used before it was approved: approve it first, then ask later.

We were also told that we would not see one item of detail on how this money would be spent. Taxpayers will be looking at $7.4 billion and they will be wondering where it went. However, we will not know. It will only show in the *Public Accounts*, after the next election, as a lump sum transfer with no detail.

● (2200)

The Deputy Speaker: It being 10 p.m., it is my duty to interrupt the proceedings and put forthwith every question necessary to dispose of the business of supply.

Call in the members.

[*For continuation of proceedings see part B*]

CONTENTS

Thursday, June 14, 2018

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

Public Sector Integrity Commissioner
The Speaker ... 20935

Parliamentary Budget Officer
The Speaker ... 20935

Conflict of Interest and Ethics Commissioner
The Speaker ... 20935

Foreign Affairs
Mr. DeCourcey ... 20935

Government Response to Petitions
Mr. Lamoureux ... 20935

Comprehensive and Progressive Agreement for Trans-Pacific Partnership Implementation Act
Mr. Champagne ... 20935
Bill C-79. Introduction and first reading ... 20935
(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed) ... 20935

Committees of the House
International Trade
Mr. Eyking ... 20935
Transport, Infrastructure and Communities
Ms. Sgro ... 20936
Procedure and House Affairs
Mr. Bagnell ... 20936
Status of Women
Mrs. Vecchio ... 20936
Ms. Harder ... 20936
Procedure and House Affairs
Mr. Bagnell ... 20936
Motion for concurrence ... 20936
(Motion agreed to) ... 20936

Petitions
Human Organ Trafficking
Mr. Brassard ... 20936
Pensions
Ms. Mathyssen ... 20937
Postal Banking
Ms. Mathyssen ... 20937
Human Organ Trafficking
Mr. MacKenzie ... 20937
The Environment
Ms. Malcolmson ... 20937
Disability Tax Credit
Mr. Kmiec ... 20937
Human Organ Trafficking
Mr. Kmiec ... 20937
Human Rights
Mr. Kmiec ... 20937
Canada Summer Jobs Program
Mr. Kmiec ... 20937
Disability Tax Credit
Mr. Kmiec ... 20938
Guaranteed Income Supplement
Ms. Trudel ... 20938
Kinder Morgan Pipeline
Ms. May (Saanich—Gulf Islands) ... 20938
Wild Salmon
Ms. May (Saanich—Gulf Islands) ... 20938
Human Organ Trafficking
Mr. Genuis ... 20938
Gatineau Park
Mr. Anandasangaree ... 20938
Sex Selection
Mr. Calkins ... 20938
Human Organ Trafficking
Mr. Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis) ... 20938
Ms. Harder ... 20938

Questions on the Order Paper
Mr. Lamoureux ... 20938

Questions Passed as Orders for Returns
Mr. Lamoureux ... 20939

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Business of Supply
Opposition Motion—Carbon Pricing
Mr. Poilievre ... 20940
Motion ... 20940
Mrs. Caesar-Chavannes ... 20943
Ms. Malcolmson ... 20943
Mr. Lightbound ... 20943
Mr. Carrie ... 20944
Ms. May (Saanich—Gulf Islands) ... 20944
Mr. Lightbound ... 20945
Mr. Carrie ... 20947
Ms. Boutin-Sweet ... 20947
Mr. Kmiec ... 20947
Mrs. Caesar-Chavannes ... 20948
Mr. Dusseault ... 20948
Mr. Barlow ... 20951
Mr. Lamoureux ... 20951
Mr. Davies ... 20952
Mr. Barlow ... 20952
Mr. Lamoureux ... 20953
Mr. Davies ... 20954

Points of Order
Draft Appropriation Bill—Main Estimates, 2018-19
Mr. McCauley ... 20954

Business of Supply
Opposition Motion—Carbon Pricing
Motion ... 20955
Mr. Hoback ... 20955

Mr. Vaughan ... 20956
Ms. May (Saanich—Gulf Islands) ... 20957
Mr. Barlow ... 20957
Mr. Scarpaleggia ... 20957
Mr. Albrecht ... 20959
Ms. Malcolmson ... 20959
Mr. Poissant ... 20959
Mr. Albrecht ... 20960
Ms. May (Saanich—Gulf Islands) ... 20961
Mr. Albrecht ... 20961
Mr. Badawey ... 20962
Mr. Beech ... 20963
Mr. Nuttall ... 20963
Mr. Vaughan ... 20965
Mr. Davies ... 20965
Mr. Fillmore ... 20965
Mr. Albrecht ... 20967
Mr. Viersen ... 20967
Mr. Vaughan ... 20968
Mr. Bossio ... 20968
Mr. Brassard ... 20969
Ms. Boutin-Sweet ... 20969
Mr. Albas ... 20970
Mr. Viersen ... 20970

Points of Order

Draft Appropriation Bill—Main Estimates, 2018-19

Mr. Lamoureux ... 20971

Business of Supply

Opposition Motion—Carbon Pricing

Motion ... 20971
Mr. Viersen ... 20971

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

Indigenous Languages

Ms. May (Saanich—Gulf Islands) ... 20971

Fleur Bleue Heritage Achievement Award

Mr. Rioux ... 20972

National Lacrosse League

Mr. Waugh ... 20972

Violence against Health Care Workers

Mr. Eyolfson ... 20972

Canada Revenue Agency

Mr. Blaikie ... 20972

Madawaska—Restigouche

Mr. Arseneault ... 20972

Hockey Night in Barrie

Mr. Nuttall ... 20973

Armed Forces Day in North Bay

Mr. Rota ... 20973

Pride Month

Ms. Fry ... 20973

Marijuana

Mr. Allison ... 20973

Kidney Dialysis Treatment

Ms. Rudd ... 20974

National Public Service Week

Mr. Aldag ... 20974

Canada Summer Jobs Program

Mrs. Stubbs ... 20974

Blood Donation

Ms. Sahota ... 20974

Estuary Restoration

Mr. Johns ... 20974

International Trade

Mr. Carrie ... 20975

Ramadan

Mrs. Schulte ... 20975

ORAL QUESTIONS

Marijuana

Mr. Deltell ... 20975
Ms. Petitpas Taylor ... 20975
Mr. Deltell ... 20975
Ms. Petitpas Taylor ... 20975

Fisheries and Oceans

Ms. Raitt ... 20976
Mr. LeBlanc ... 20976

Carbon Pricing

Ms. Raitt ... 20976
Ms. McKenna ... 20976
Ms. Raitt ... 20976
Ms. McKenna ... 20976

Natural Resources

Mr. Caron ... 20976
Ms. McKenna ... 20976
Mr. Caron ... 20976
Ms. McKenna ... 20977
Mr. Boulerice ... 20977
Mr. Garneau ... 20977
Ms. Malcolmson ... 20977
Mr. Garneau ... 20977

Carbon Pricing

Mr. Poilievre ... 20977
Ms. McKenna ... 20977
Mr. Poilievre ... 20977
Ms. McKenna ... 20977
Mr. Poilievre ... 20977
Ms. McKenna ... 20978
Mr. Poilievre ... 20978
Ms. McKenna ... 20978
Ms. Rempel ... 20978
Ms. Monsef ... 20978
Ms. Rempel ... 20978
Ms. Monsef ... 20978

International Trade

Ms. Brosseau ... 20978

Mr. Poissant ... 20978
Mr. MacGregor ... 20979
Mr. Poissant ... 20979

Carbon Pricing
Mr. Barlow ... 20979
Ms. McKenna ... 20979
Mr. Hoback ... 20979
Ms. McKenna ... 20979
Mrs. Wong ... 20979
Mr. Duclos ... 20979
Mr. Albas ... 20979
Ms. Chagger ... 20980

International Trade
Mr. Duvall ... 20980
Mr. Bains ... 20980
Ms. Trudel ... 20980
Mr. Bains ... 20980
Mr. Chen ... 20980
Mr. Champagne ... 20980

Carbon Pricing
Mrs. Gallant ... 20980
Mr. Duclos ... 20980
Mr. O'Toole ... 20981
Mr. Bains ... 20981
Mr. Fast ... 20981
Ms. McKenna ... 20981
Mr. Fast ... 20981
Ms. McKenna ... 20981

International Trade
Mr. Choquette ... 20981
Mr. Champagne ... 20981
Ms. Ramsey ... 20981
Mr. Champagne ... 20982

Immigration, Refugees, and Citizenship
Mr. Paul-Hus ... 20982
Mr. Garneau ... 20982
Mr. Paul-Hus ... 20982
Mr. Goodale ... 20982
Mr. Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis) ... 20982
Mr. Goodale ... 20982

Telecommunications
Ms. Yip ... 20982
Mr. Bains ... 20982

Foreign Affairs
Mr. Kent ... 20983
Mr. DeCourcey ... 20983

Marijuana
Mr. Davies ... 20983
Mr. Goodale ... 20983

Housing
Mr. Breton ... 20983
Mr. Duclos ... 20983

Foreign Affairs
Mr. Genuis ... 20983
Mr. Goodale ... 20983

Marijuana
Mr. Fortin ... 20984
Ms. Petitpas Taylor ... 20984
Mr. Fortin ... 20984
Ms. Petitpas Taylor ... 20984

Natural Resources
Ms. May (Saanich—Gulf Islands) ... 20984
Ms. Rudd ... 20984

Points of Order
Oral Questions
Mr. Sweet ... 20985

Business of the House
Ms. Bergen ... 20985
Ms. Chagger ... 20985

Hon. Member for Outremont
Mr. Caron ... 20985
Mr. Garneau ... 20986
Ms. Raitt ... 20986
Mr. Fortin ... 20987
Ms. May (Saanich—Gulf Islands) ... 20987
Mr. Mulcair ... 20988

Points of Order
Draft Appropriation Bill—Main Estimates, 2018-19
Mr. Strahl ... 20990

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Business of Supply
Opposition Motion—Carbon Pricing
Motion ... 20990
Mr. Brassard ... 20990
Mr. Drouin ... 20991
Mr. Nantel ... 20992
Mr. Amos ... 20992
Mr. Dreeshen ... 20994
Mr. Duvall ... 20994
Mr. Drouin ... 20994
Mr. MacKenzie ... 20995
Mr. Nantel ... 20996
Mr. Lamoureux ... 20996

Points of Order
Draft Appropriation Bill—Main Estimates, 2018-19
Mr. Blaikie ... 20996

Business of Supply
Opposition Motion—Carbon Pricing
Motion ... 20997
Mr. Albas ... 20997
Mr. Fragiskatos ... 20998
Mr. Johns ... 20999
Ms. Rempel ... 20999
Mr. Lamoureux ... 21000
Mr. Johns ... 21001
Ms. Duncan (Edmonton Strathcona) ... 21001
Division on motion deferred ... 21004

Main Estimates, 2018-19

Concurrence in Vote 1—Northern Pipeline Agency

Mr. Brison ... 21004
Motion No. 1 ... 21004
Mr. McCauley ... 21006
Mr. Blaikie ... 21007
Ms. Lapointe ... 21007
Mr. McCauley ... 21007
Mr. Deltell ... 21008
Mr. Longfield ... 21009
Mr. Blaikie ... 21009
Mr. Brison ... 21010
Mrs. McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo) ... 21010
Mr. Fergus ... 21011
Mr. Blaikie ... 21011
Ms. Lapointe ... 21011
Mr. Blaikie ... 21012
Mr. Fergus ... 21014
Mr. McCauley ... 21015
Mr. Lamoureux ... 21015
Mr. Nantel ... 21016

Points of Order

Draft Appropriation Bill—Main Estimates, 2018-19—Speaker's Ruling

The Deputy Speaker ... 21016

Main Estimates, 2018-19

Concurrence in Vote 1—Northern Pipeline Agency

Motion No. 1 ... 21017
Mr. Simms ... 21017
Mrs. Gallant ... 21019
Mr. Blaikie ... 21019
Mr. Drouin ... 21019
Mr. O'Toole ... 21021
Mr. Nantel ... 21021
Mrs. Gallant ... 21021
Mrs. Gallant ... 21021
Mr. Peterson ... 21023
Mr. Nantel ... 21023
Mr. Albrecht ... 21023
Mr. Lukiwski ... 21024
Mr. Jowhari ... 21025
Mr. Aboultaif ... 21025
Mr. Vaughan ... 21025
Ms. Khalid ... 21026
Ms. Harder ... 21027
Ms. Malcolmson ... 21027
Mr. Peterson ... 21027
Mr. Genuis ... 21029
Mr. Garrison ... 21029
Ms. Harder ... 21030
Mr. Bagnell ... 21031
Mr. Nantel ... 21031
Mr. Aboultaif ... 21031
Mr. Lloyd ... 21032
Mr. Vaughan ... 21033
Mr. Garrison ... 21034
Mr. Lamoureux ... 21034
Mr. O'Toole ... 21036
Mr. Ste-Marie ... 21036
Mr. Genuis ... 21037
Ms. Tassi ... 21037
Mr. Nantel ... 21037
Mr. Kent ... 21038
Mr. Lamoureux ... 21039
Mr. Kmiec ... 21039
Mr. Nater ... 21039
Mr. McCauley ... 21040
Mr. Brison ... 21041
Mr. Blaikie ... 21042

Published under the authority of the Speaker of
the House of Commons

SPEAKER'S PERMISSION

The proceedings of the House of Commons and its Committees are hereby made available to provide greater public access. The parliamentary privilege of the House of Commons to control the publication and broadcast of the proceedings of the House of Commons and its Committees is nonetheless reserved. All copyrights therein are also reserved.

Reproduction of the proceedings of the House of Commons and its Committees, in whole or in part and in any medium, is hereby permitted provided that the reproduction is accurate and is not presented as official. This permission does not extend to reproduction, distribution or use for commercial purpose of financial gain. Reproduction or use outside this permission or without authorization may be treated as copyright infringement in accordance with the *Copyright Act*. Authorization may be obtained on written application to the Office of the Speaker of the House of Commons.

Reproduction in accordance with this permission does not constitute publication under the authority of the House of Commons. The absolute privilege that applies to the proceedings of the House of Commons does not extend to these permitted reproductions. Where a reproduction includes briefs to a Committee of the House of Commons, authorization for reproduction may be required from the authors in accordance with the *Copyright Act*.

Nothing in this permission abrogates or derogates from the privileges, powers, immunities and rights of the House of Commons and its Committees. For greater certainty, this permission does not affect the prohibition against impeaching or questioning the proceedings of the House of Commons in courts or otherwise. The House of Commons retains the right and privilege to find users in contempt of Parliament if a reproduction or use is not in accordance with this permission.

Also available on the House of Commons website at the following address: http://www.ourcommons.ca

Publié en conformité de l'autorité
du Président de la Chambre des communes

PERMISSION DU PRÉSIDENT

Les délibérations de la Chambre des communes et de ses comités sont mises à la disposition du public pour mieux le renseigner. La Chambre conserve néanmoins son privilège parlementaire de contrôler la publication et la diffusion des délibérations et elle possède tous les droits d'auteur sur celles-ci.

Il est permis de reproduire les délibérations de la Chambre et de ses comités, en tout ou en partie, sur n'importe quel support, pourvu que la reproduction soit exacte et qu'elle ne soit pas présentée comme version officielle. Il n'est toutefois pas permis de reproduire, de distribuer ou d'utiliser les délibérations à des fins commerciales visant la réalisation d'un profit financier. Toute reproduction ou utilisation non permise ou non formellement autorisée peut être considérée comme une violation du droit d'auteur aux termes de la *Loi sur le droit d'auteur*. Une autorisation formelle peut être obtenue sur présentation d'une demande écrite au Bureau du Président de la Chambre.

La reproduction conforme à la présente permission ne constitue pas une publication sous l'autorité de la Chambre. Le privilège absolu qui s'applique aux délibérations de la Chambre ne s'étend pas aux reproductions permises. Lorsqu'une reproduction comprend des mémoires présentés à un comité de la Chambre, il peut être nécessaire d'obtenir de leurs auteurs l'autorisation de les reproduire, conformément à la *Loi sur le droit d'auteur*.

La présente permission ne porte pas atteinte aux privilèges, pouvoirs, immunités et droits de la Chambre et de ses comités. Il est entendu que cette permission ne touche pas l'interdiction de contester ou de mettre en cause les délibérations de la Chambre devant les tribunaux ou autrement. La Chambre conserve le droit et le privilège de déclarer l'utilisateur coupable d'outrage au Parlement lorsque la reproduction ou l'utilisation n'est pas conforme à la présente permission.

Aussi disponible sur le site Web de la Chambre des communes à l'adresse suivante : http://www.noscommunes.ca

HOUSE OF COMMONS
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES
CANADA

House of Commons Debates

VOLUME 148 • NUMBER 315 • 1st SESSION • 42nd PARLIAMENT

OFFICIAL REPORT
(HANSARD)

Thursday, June 14, 2018
(Part B)

Speaker: The Honourable Geoff Regan

CONTENTS

(Table of Contents appears at back of this issue.)

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Thursday, June 14, 2018

[*Continuation of proceedings from part A*]

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

• (2230)

[*English*]

BUSINESS OF SUPPLY

OPPOSITION MOTION—CARBON PRICING

The House resumed consideration of the motion.

The Speaker: The question is on the opposition motion relating to the business of supply.

• (2235)

Before the Clerk announced the results of the vote:

Mr. Tom Kmiec: Mr. Speaker, I know the night is young, but I believe that the member for Brampton East has lost his jacket, and therefore cannot have his vote counted during this recorded vote.

• (2240)

Mr. Raj Grewal: Mr. Speaker, I did check the rules and checked the definition of a jacket. This is per the definition of a jacket. However, I will not have my vote counted and will get a suit jacket for the next vote.

The Speaker: The hon. member cannot be speaking without a tie on. He should be in business attire. I would like him to get a jacket.

Of course, in that case, I will expect members to remain in business attire throughout the voting.

(The House divided on the motion, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 761)

YEAS

Members

Aboultaif
Albrecht
Anderson
Benzen
Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis)
Chong
Cooper
Diotte
Dreeshen
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Finley
Albas
Allison
Barlow
Bergen
Brassard
Clarke
Deltell
Doherty
Eglinski
Fast
Gallant
Genuis
Gourde
Hoback
Kelly
Kitchen
Kusie
Lanzon (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)
Liepert
Lobb
MacKenzie
McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)
Nater
Obhrai
Paul-Hus
Reid
Saroya
Shields
Sorenson
Stubbs
Trost
Viersen
Warawa
Waugh
Wong
Zimmer — 71

NAYS

Members

Aldag
Alleslev
Anandasangaree
Arya
Ayoub
Bagnell
Barsalou-Duval
Beech
Bibeau
Blair
Boissonnault
Boudrias
Bratina
Brison
Caesar-Chavannes
Casey (Cumberland—Colchester)
Chagger
Chen
Cormier
Dabrusin
DeCourcey
Dhillon
Dubé
Duclos
Duncan (Edmonton—Strathcona)
Dzerowicz
Ehsassi
Ellis
Eyolfson
Fillmore
Fonseca
Fortin
Fraser (West Nova)
Fry
Garneau
Gerretsen
Goodale
Graham
Godin
Harder
Jeneroux
Kent
Kmiec
Lake
Leitch
Lloyd
Lukiwski
McCauley (Edmonton West)
Motz
Nuttall
O'Toole
Poilievre
Richards
Schmale
Shipley
Strahl
Tilson
Van Loan
Wagantall
Warkentin
Webber
Yurdiga

Alghabra
Amos
Arseneault
Aubin
Badawey
Bains
Baylis
Bennett
Blaikie
Blaney (North Island—Powell River)
Bossio
Boutin-Sweet
Breton
Brosseau
Caron
Casey (Charlottetown)
Champagne
Choquette
Cuzner
Damoff
Dhaliwal
Drouin
Dubourg
Duguid
Duvall
Easter
El-Khoury
Eyking
Fergus
Fisher
Fortier
Fragiskatos
Fraser (Central Nova)
Fuhr
Garrison
Goldsmith-Jones
Gould
Hajdu

Harvey	Hébert
Hehr	Hogg
Holland	Housefather
Hussen	Hutchings
Iacono	Joly
Jones	Jowhari
Khalid	Khera
Kwan	Lametti
Lamoureux	Lapointe
Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite Nation)	Lebouthillier
Leslie	Levitt
Lightbound	Lockhart
Long	Longfield
Ludwig	MacGregor
MacKinnon (Gatineau)	Malcolmson
Maloney	Marcil
Masse (Windsor West)	Mathyssen
May (Cambridge)	McCrimmon
McGuinty	McKay
McKenna	McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
McLeod (Northwest Territories)	Mendès
Mendicino	Mihychuk
Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île des Sœurs)	
Monsef	
Murray	Nault
Ng	O'Connell
Oliphant	Oliver
O'Regan	Ouellette
Paradis	Pauzé
Peschisolido	Peterson
Petitpas Taylor	Philpott
Picard	Poissant
Quach	Qualtrough
Ramsey	Ratansi
Rioux	Robillard
Rodriguez	Rogers
Romanado	Rudd
Ruimy	Sahota
Saini	Sajjan
Samson	Sangha
Sarai	Scarpaleggia
Schiefke	Schulte
Serré	Sgro
Shanahan	Sheehan
Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)	Sidhu (Brampton South)
Sikand	Simms
Sohi	Sorbara
Spengemann	Ste-Marie
Tabbara	Tan
Tassi	Thériault
Trudeau	Trudel
Vandal	Vandenbeld
Vaughan	Whalen
Wilson-Raybould	Wrzesnewskyj
Yip	Young — 184

PAIRED

Members

Beaulieu	Gill
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)	
Plamondon	
Wilkinson	Zahid — 6

The Speaker: I declare the motion defeated.

* * *

[*Translation*]

MAIN ESTIMATES, 2018-19

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 1—NORTHERN PIPELINE AGENCY

The House resumed consideration of Motion No. 1.

The Speaker: The question is on Motion No. 1. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And five or more members having risen:

● (2245)

(The House divided on Motion No. 1, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 762)

YEAS

Members

Aldag	Alghabra
Alleslev	Amos
Anandasangaree	Arseneault
Arya	Aubin
Ayoub	Badawey
Bagnell	Bains
Baylis	Beech
Bennett	Bibeau
Blaikie	Blair
Blaney (North Island—Powell River)	Boissonnault
Bossio	Boutin-Sweet
Bratina	Breton
Brison	Brosseau
Caesar-Chavannes	Caron
Casey (Cumberland—Colchester)	Casey (Charlottetown)
Chagger	Champagne
Chen	Choquette
Cormier	Cuzner
Dabrusin	Damoff
DeCourcey	Dhaliwal
Dhillon	Drouin
Dubé	Dubourg
Duclos	Duguid
Duncan (Edmonton Strathcona)	Duvall
Dzerowicz	Easter
Ehsassi	El-Khoury
Ellis	Erskine-Smith
Eyking	Eyolfson
Fergus	Filmore
Fisher	Fonseca
Fortier	Fragiskatos
Fraser (West Nova)	Fraser (Central Nova)
Fry	Fuhr
Garneau	Garrison
Gerretsen	Goldsmith-Jones
Goodale	Gould
Graham	Grewal
Hajdu	Harvey
Hébert	Hehr
Hogg	Holland
Housefather	Hussen
Hutchings	Iacono
Johns	Joly
Jones	Jowhari
Khalid	Khera
Kwan	Lambropoulos
Lametti	Lamoureux
Lapointe	Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite Nation)
Lebouthillier	Leslie
Levitt	Lightbound
Lockhart	Long
Longfield	Ludwig
MacGregor	MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Malcolmson	Maloney
Masse (Windsor West)	Mathyssen

May (Cambridge)
McGuinty
McKenna
McLeod (Northwest Territories)
Mendicino
Miller (Ville Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île des Sœurs)
Monsef
Murray
Ng
Oliphant
O'Regan
Paradis
Peterson
Philpott
Poissant
Qualtrough
Ratansi
Robillard
Rogers
Rudd
Sahota
Sajjan
Sangha
Scarpaleggia
Schulte
Sgro
Sheehan
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Simms
Sorbara
Tabbara
Tassi
Trudel
Vandenbeld
Whalen
Wrzesnewskyj
Young — 181

McCrimmon
McKay
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
Mendès
Mihychuk
Nault
O'Connell
Oliver
Ouellette
Peschisolido
Petitpas Taylor
Picard
Quach
Ramsey
Rioux
Rodriguez
Romanado
Ruimy
Saini
Samson
Sarai
Schiefke
Serré
Shanahan
Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)
Sikand
Sohi
Spengemann
Tan
Trudeau
Vandal
Vaughan
Wilson-Raybould
Yip

NAYS

Members

Aboultaif
Albrecht
Anderson
Barsalou-Duval
Bergen
Brassard
Clarke
Deltell
Doherty
Eglinski
Fast
Fortin
Genuis
Gourde
Hoback
Kelly
Kitchen
Kusie
Lauzon (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)
Liepert
Lobb
MacKenzie
McCauley (Edmonton West)
Motz
Nuttall
O'Toole
Pauzé
Reid
Saroya
Shields
Sorenson
Strahl
Thériault
Trost
Viersen
Warawa
Waugh
Wong
Zimmer — 77

Albas
Allison
Barlow
Benzen
Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis)
Chong
Cooper
Diotte
Dreeshen
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Finley
Gallant
Godin
Harder
Jeneroux
Kent
Kmiec
Lake
Leitch
Lloyd
Lukiwski
Marcil
McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)
Nater
Obhrai
Paul-Hus
Poilievre
Richards
Schmale
Shipley
Ste-Marie
Stubbs
Tilson
Van Loan
Wagantall
Warkentin
Webber
Yurdiga

PAIRED

Members

Beaulieu—Gill
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)—Plamondon
Wilkinson—Zahid — 6

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 1 carried.

[*English*]

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 1—CANADIAN ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT AGENCY

Hon. Scott Brison (President of the Treasury Board, Lib.) moved:

That Vote 1, in the amount of $30,232,320, under Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency—Program expenditures and contributions, in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2019, be concurred in.

The Speaker: The next question is on Motion No. 2. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And five or more members having risen:

● (2255)

(The House divided on Motion No. 2, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 763)

YEAS

Members

Aldag
Alleslev
Anandasangaree
Arya
Ayoub
Bagnell
Baylis
Bennett
Blaikie
Blaney (North Island—Powell River)
Bossio
Bratina
Brison
Caesar-Chavannes
Casey (Cumberland—Colchester)
Chagger
Chen
Cormier
Dabrusin
DeCourcey
Dhillon
Dubé
Duclos
Duncan (Edmonton—Strathcona)
Dzerowicz
Ehsassi
Ellis

Alghabra
Amos
Arseneault
Aubin
Badawey
Bains
Beech
Bibeau
Blair
Boissonnault
Boutin-Sweet
Breton
Brosseau
Caron
Casey (Charlottetown)
Champagne
Choquette
Cuzner
Damoff
Dhaliwal
Drouin
Dubourg
Duguid
Duvall
Easter
El-Khoury
Erskine-Smith

Eyking
Eyolfson
Fergus
Fillmore
Fisher
Fonseca
Fortier
Fragiskatos
Fraser (West Nova)
Fraser (Central Nova)
Fry
Fuhr
Gameau
Garrison
Gerretsen
Goldsmith Jones
Goodale
Gould
Graham
Grewal
Hajdu
Harvey
Hébert
Hehr
Hogg
Holland
Housefather
Hussen
Hutchings
Iacono
Johns
Joly
Jones
Jowhari
Khalid
Khera
Kwan
Lambropoulos
Lametti
Lamoureux
Lapointe
Lauzon (Argenteuil — La Petite Nation)
Lebouthillier
Leslie
Levitt
Lightbound
Lockhart
Long
Longfield
Ludwig
MacGregor
MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Malcolmson
Maloney
Masse (Windsor West)
Matthyssen
May (Cambridge)
McCrimmon
McGuinty
McKay
McKenna
McKinnon (Coquitlam — Port Coquitlam)
McLeod (Northwest Territories)
Mendès
Mendicino
Mihychuk
Miller (Ville-Marie — Le Sud-Ouest — Île-des-Sœurs)
Monsef
Murray
Nault
Ng
O'Connell
Oliphant
Oliver
O'Regan
Ouellette
Paradis
Peschisolido
Peterson
Petitpas Taylor
Philpott
Picard
Poissant
Quach
Qualtrough
Ramsey
Ratansi
Rioux
Robillard
Rodriguez
Rogers
Romanado
Rudd
Rumny
Sahota
Saini
Sajjan
Samson
Sangha
Sarai
Scarpaleggia
Schiefke
Schulte
Serré
Sgro
Shanahan
Sheehan
Sidhu (Mission — Matsqui — Fraser Canyon)
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Sikand
Simms
Sohi
Sorbara
Spengemann
Tabbara
Tan
Tassi
Trudeau
Trudel
Vandal
Vandenbeld
Vaughan
Whalen
Wilson-Raybould
Wrzesnewskyj
Yip
Young — 181

NAYS

Members

Aboultaif
Albas
Albrecht
Allison
Anderson
Barlow
Barsalou-Duval
Benzen
Bergen
Blaney (Bellechasse — Les Etchemins — Lévis)
Boudrias
Brassard
Chong
Clarke
Cooper
Deltell
Diotte
Doherty
Dreeshen
Eglinski
Falk (Battlefords — Lloydminster)
Fast
Finley
Fortin
Gallant
Genuis
Godin
Gourde
Harder
Hoback
Jeneroux
Kelly
Kent
Kitchen
Kmiec
Kusie
Lake
Lauzon (Stormont — Dundas — South Glengarry)
Leitch
Liepert
Lloyd
Lobb
Lukiwski
MacKenzie
Marcil
McCauley (Edmonton West)
McLeod (Kamloops — Thompson — Cariboo)
Motz
Nater
Nuttall
Obhrai
O'Toole
Paul-Hus
Pauzé
Poilievre
Reid
Richards
Saroya
Schmale
Shields
Shipley
Sorenson
Ste-Marie
Strahl
Stubbs
Thériault
Tilson
Trost
Van Loan
Viersen
Wagantall
Warawa
Warkentin
Waugh
Webber
Wong
Yurdiga
Zimmer — 78

PAIRED

Members

Beaulieu — Gill
Massé (Avignon — La Mitis — Matane — Matapédia) — Plamondon
Wilkinson — Zahid — 6

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 2 carried.

● (2300)

[*Translation*]

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 1—CANADIAN FOOD INSPECTION AGENCY

Hon. Scott Brison (President of the Treasury Board, Lib.) moved:

That Vote 1, in the amount of $535,823,238, under Canadian Food Inspection Agency—Operating expenditures, grants and contributions, in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2019, be concurred in.

The Speaker: The question is on Motion No. 3. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And five or more members having risen:

(The House divided on Motion No. 3, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 764)

YEAS

Members

Aldag
Alleslev
Anandasangaree
Arya
Ayoub
Bagnell
Baylis
Bennett
Blaikie
Blaney (North Island—Powell River)
Bossio
Bratina
Brison
Caesar-Chavannes
Casey (Cumberland—Colchester)
Chagger
Chen
Cormier
Dabrusin
DeCourcey
Dhillon
Dubé
Duclos
Duncan (Edmonton—Strathcona)
Dzerowicz
Ehsassi
Ellis
Eyking
Fergus
Fisher
Fortier
Fraser (West Nova)
Fry
Garneau
Gerretsen
Goodale
Graham
Hajdu
Hébert
Hogg
Housefather
Hutchings
Iohus
Jones
Khalid
Kwan
Lametti
Lapointe
Lebouthillier
Levitt
Lockhart
Longfield
MacGregor
Malcolmson
Masse (Windsor West)
May (Cambridge)
McGuinty
McKenna
McLeod (Northwest Territories)
Mendicino
Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île-des-Sœurs)
Monsef
Murray
Ng
Oliphant
O'Regan
Paradis
Peterson
Philpott
Poissant
Qualtrough
Rafferty
Robillard
Rogers
Rudd
Sahota
Sajjan
Sangha
Scarpaleggia
Schulte
Sgro
Sheehan
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Simms
Sorbara
Tabbara
Tassi
Trudel
Vandenbeld
Whalen
Wrzesnewskyj
Young — 181

Afghafara
Amos
Arseneault
Aubin
Badawey
Bains
Beech
Bibeau
Blair
Boissonnault
Boutin-Sweet
Breton
Brosseau
Caron
Casey (Charlottetown)
Champagne
Choquette
Cuzner
Damoff
Dhaliwal
Drouin
Dubourg
Duguid
Duvall
Easter
El Khoury
Erskine-Smith
Eyolfson
Fillmore
Fonseca
Fragiskatos
Fraser (Central Nova)
Fuhr
Garrison
Goldsmith-Jones
Gould
Grewal
Harvey
Hehr
Holland
Hussen
Iacono
Joly
Jowhari
Khera
Lambropoulos
Lamoureux
Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation)
Leslie
Lightbound
Long
Ludwig
MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Maloney
Mathyssen
McCrimmon
McKay
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
Mendès
Mihychuk
Nault
O'Connell
Oliver
Ouellette
Peschisolido
Petitpas Taylor
Picard
Quach
Ramsey
Rioux
Rodriguez
Romanado
Ruimy
Saini
Samson
Sarai
Schiefke
Serré
Shanahan
Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)
Sikand
Sohi
Spengemann
Tan
Trudeau
Vandal
Vaughan
Wilson-Raybould
Yip

NAYS

Members

Albas
Allison
Barlow
Benzen
Blaney (Rivière-des-Mille-Îles—Les Etchemins—Lévis)
Brassard
Clarke
Deltell
Doherty
Eglinski
Finst
Fortin
Gemmis
Gourde
Hoback
Kelly
Kitchen
Kmiec
Lauzon (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)
Liepert
Lobb
MacKenzie
McCauley (Edmonton West)
Motz
Nuttall
O'Toole
Paul-Hus
Poilievre
Rempel
Saroya
Shields
Sorenson
Strahl
Thériault
Trost
Viersen
Warawa
Waugh
Wong
Zimmer — 79

PAIRED

Members

Beaulieu — Gill
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)—Plamondon
Wilkinson — Zahid — 6

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 3 carried.

[English]

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 5—CANADIAN FOOD INSPECTION AGENCY

Hon. Scott Brison (President of the Treasury Board, Lib.) moved:

That Vote 5, in the amount of $25,608,189, under Canadian Food Inspection Agency—Capital expenditures, in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2019, be concurred in.

The Speaker: The question is on Motion No. 4. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And five or more members having risen:

● (2310)

(The House divided on Motion No. 4, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 765)

YEAS

Members

Aldag
Alleslev
Anandasangaree
Arya
Ayoub
Bagnell
Baylis
Bennett
Blaikie
Blaney (North Island Powell River)
Bossio
Bratina
Brison
Caesar Chavannes
Casey (Cumberland Colchester)
Chagger
Chen
Cormier
Dabrusin
DeCourcey
Dhillon
Dubé
Duclos
Duncan (Edmonton Strathcona)
Dzerowicz
Ehsassi
Ellis
Eyking
Fergus
Fisher
Fortier
Fraser (West Nova)
Fry
Gameau
Gerretsen
Goodale
Graham
Hajdu
Hébert
Hogg
Housefather
Hutchings
Johns
Jones
Khalid
Kwan
Lametti
Lapointe
Lebouthillier
Levitt
Lockhart
Longfield
MacGregor
Malcolmson
Masse (Windsor West)
May (Cambridge)
McGuinty
McKenna
McLeod (Northwest Territories)
Mendicino
Miller (Ville Marie Le Sud Ouest Île des Sœurs)
Monsef
Murray
Ng
Oliphant
O'Regan
Paradis
Peterson
Philpott
Poissant
Qualtrough
Ratansi
Robillard
Rogers
Rudd
Saboia
Sajjan
Sangha
Scarpaleggia
Schulte
Sgro
Sheefsen
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Simms
Sohara
Tabbara
Tassi
Trudel
Vandenbeld
Whalen
Wrzesnewskyj
Young 181

Alghabra
Amos
Arseneault
Aubin
Badawey
Bains
Beech
Bibeau
Blair
Boissonnault
Boutin Sweet
Breton
Brosseau
Caron
Casey (Charlottetown)
Champagne
Choquette
Cuzner
Damoff
Dhaliwal
Drouin
Dubourg
Duguid
Duvall
Easter
El Khoury
Erskine Smith
Eyolfson
Fillmore
Fonseca
Fragiskatos
Fraser (Central Nova)
Fuhr
Garrison
Goldsmith Jones
Gould
Grewal
Harvey
Hehr
Holland
Hussen
Iacono
Joly
Jowhari
Khera
Lambropoulos
Lamoureux
Lauzon (Argenteuil La Petite Nation)
Leslie
Lightbound
Long
Ludwig
MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Maloney
Matthyssen
McCrimmon
McKay
McKinnon (Coquitlam Port Coquitlam)
Mendès
Mihychuk
Nault
O'Connell
Oliver
Ouellette
Peschisolido
Petitpas Taylor
Picard
Quach
Ramsey
Rioux
Rodriguez
Romanado
Rumy
Sarai
Samson
Sarai
Schiefke
Serré
Shanahan
Sidhu (Mission Matsqui Fraser Canyon)
Sikand
Sohi
Spengemann
Tan
Trudeau
Vandal
Vaughan
Wilson Raybould
Yip

NAYS

Members

Albas
Allison
Barlow
Benzen
Blaney (Bellechasse Les Etchemins Lévis)
Brassard
Clarke
Deltell
Doherty
Eglinski
Fast
Fortin
Genuis
Gourde
Hoback
Kelly
Kitchen
Kmiec
Lauzon (Stormont Dundas South Glengarry)
Liepert
Lobb
MacKenzie
McCauley (Edmonton West)
Motz
Nuttall
Paul Hus
Poilievre
Rempel
Saroya
Shields
Sorenson
Strahl
Thériault
Trost
Viersen
Warawa

Aboultaif
Albrecht
Anderson
Barsalou Duval
Bergen
Boudrias
Chong
Cooper
Diotte
Dreeshen
Falk (Battlefords Lloydminster)
Finley
Gallant
Godin
Harder
Jeneroux
Kent
Kmiec
Lake
Leitch
Lloyd
Lukiwski
Marcil
McLeod (Kamloops Thompson Cariboo)
Nater
O'Toole
Paul
Reid
Richards
Schmale
Shipley
Ste Marie
Stubbs
Tilson
Van Loan
Wagantall

Warkentin	Waugh
Webber	Wong
Yurdiga	Zimmer — 78

PAIRED

Members

Beaulieu	Gill
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)	
Plamondon	
Wilkinson	Zahid — 6

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 4 carried.

[*Translation*]

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 1—CANADIAN NORTHERN ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AGENCY

Hon. Scott Brison (President of the Treasury Board, Lib.) moved:

That Vote 1, in the amount of $11,976,317, under Canadian Northern Economic Development Agency—Operating expenditures, in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2019, be concurred in.

The Speaker: The question is on Motion No. 5. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And five or more members having risen:

● (2315)

(The House divided on Motion No. 5, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 766)

YEAS

Members

Aldag	Alghabra
Alleslev	Amos
Amandasangaree	Arseneault
Arya	Aubin
Ayoub	Badawey
Bagnell	Bains
Baylis	Beech
Bennett	Bibeau
Blaikie	Blair
Blaney (North Island—Powell River)	Boissonnault
Bossio	Boutin-Sweet
Bratina	Breton
Brison	Brosseau
Caesar-Chavannes	Caron
Casey (Cumberland—Colchester)	Casey (Charlottetown)
Chagger	Champagne
Chen	Choquette
Cormier	Cuzner
Dabrusin	Damoff
DeCourcey	Dhaliwal
Dhillon	Drouin
Dubé	Dubourg
Duclos	Duguid
Duncan (Edmonton Strathcona)	Duvall
Dzerowicz	Easter
Ehsassi	El Khoury
Ellis	Eskimo Smith
Eyking	Eyolfson
Fergus	Fillmore
Fisher	Fonseca
Fortier	Fragiskatos
Fraser (West Nova)	Fraser (Central Nova)
Fry	Fuhr
Garneau	Garrison
Gerretsen	Goldsmith-Jones
Goodale	Gould
Graham	Grewal
Hajdu	Harvey
Hébert	Hehr
Hogg	Holland
Housefather	Hussen
Hutchings	Iacono
Johns	Joly
Jones	Jowhari
Khalid	Khera
Kwan	Lambropoulos
Lametti	Lamoureux
Lapointe	Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite Nation)
Lebouthillier	Leslie
Levitt	Lightbound
Lockhart	Long
Longfield	Ludwig
MacGregor	MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Malcolmson	Maloney
Masse (Windsor West)	Mathyssen
May (Cambridge)	McCrimmon
McGuinty	McKay
McKenna	McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
McLeod (Northwest Territories)	Mendès
Mendicino	Mihychuk
Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île-des-Soeurs)	
Monsef	
Murray	Nault
Ng	O'Connell
Oliphant	Oliver
O'Regan	Ouellette
Paradis	Peschisolido
Peterson	Petitpas Taylor
Philpott	Picard
Poissant	Quach
Qualtrough	Ramsey
Ratansi	Rioux
Robillard	Rodriguez
Rogers	Romanado
Rudd	Ruimy
Sahota	Saini
Sajjan	Samson
Sangha	Sarai
Scarpaleggia	Schiefke
Schulte	Serré
Sgro	Shanahan
Sheehan	Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)
Sidhu (Brampton South)	Sikand
Simms	Sohi
Sorbara	Spengemann
Tabbara	Tan
Tassi	Trudeau
Trudel	Vandal
Vandenbeld	Vaughan
Whalen	Wilson-Raybould
Wrzesnewskyj	Yip
Young — 181	

NAYS

Members

Aboultaif	Albas
Albrecht	Allison
Anderson	Barlow
Barsalou-Duval	Benzen
Bergen	Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis)
Boudrias	Brassard
Chong	Clarke
Cooper	Deltell
Diotte	Doherty
Dreeshen	Eglinski

Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)	Fast
Finley	Fortin
Gallant	Gennis
Godin	Gourde
Harder	Hoback
Jeneroux	Kelly
Kent	Kitchen
Kmiec	Kusie
Lake	Lauzon (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)
Leitch	Liepert
Lloyd	Lobb
Lukiwski	MacKenzie
Marcil	McCauley (Edmonton West)
McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)	Motz
Nater	Nuttall
Obhrai	O'Toole
Paul-Hus	Pauzé
Poilievre	Reid
Rempel	Richards
Saroya	Schmale
Shields	Shipley
Sorenson	Ste-Marie
Strahl	Stubbs
Thériault	Tilson
Trost	Van Loan
Viersen	Wagantall
Warawa	Warkentin
Waugh	Webber
Wong	Yurdiga
Zimmer — 79	

PAIRED

Members

Beaulieu	Gill
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)	
Plamondon	
Wilkinson	Zahid — 6

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 5 carried.

[*English*]

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 5—CANADIAN NORTHERN ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AGENCY

Hon. Scott Brison (President of the Treasury Board, Lib.) moved:

That Vote 5, in the amount of $16,650,297, under Canadian Northern Economic Development Agency—Contributions, in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2019, be concurred in.

The Speaker: The question is on Motion No. 6. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And five or more members having risen:

● (2325)

(The House divided on Motion No. 6, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 767)

YEAS

Members

Aldag	Alghabra
Allesley	Amos
Anandasangaree	Arseneault
Arya	Ashton
Aubin	Ayoub
Badawey	Bagnell
Bains	Baylis
Beech	Bennett
Bibeau	Blaikie
Blair	Blaney (North Island—Powell River)
Boissonnault	Bossio
Boutin-Sweet	Bratina
Breton	Brison
Brosseau	Caesar-Chavannes
Caron	Casey (Cumberland—Colchester)
Casey (Charlottetown)	Chagger
Champagne	Chen
Choquette	Cormier
Cuzner	Dabrusin
DeCourcey	Dhaliwal
Dhillon	Drouin
Dubé	Dubourg
Duclos	Duguid
Duncan (Edmonton Strathcona)	Duvall
Dzerowicz	Easter
Ehsassi	El-Khoury
Ellis	Erskine-Smith
Eyking	Eyolfson
Fergus	Fillmore
Fisher	Fonseca
Fortier	Fragiskatos
Fraser (West Nova)	Fraser (Central Nova)
Fry	Fuhr
Garneau	Garrison
Gerretsen	Goldsmith-Jones
Goodale	Gould
Graham	Grewal
Hajdu	Harvey
Hébert	Hehr
Hogg	Holland
Housefather	Hussen
Hutchings	Iacono
Johns	Joly
Jones	Jowhari
Khalid	Khera
Kwan	Lambropoulos
Lametti	Lamoureux
Lapointe	Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation)
Lebouthillier	Leslie
Levitt	Lightbound
Lockhart	Long
Longfield	Ludwig
MacGregor	MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Malcolmson	Maloney
Masse (Windsor West)	Mathyssen
May (Cambridge)	McCrimmon
McGuinty	McKay
McKenna	McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
McLeod (Northwest Territories)	Mendès
Mendicino	Mihychuk
Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île des Sœurs)	
Monsef	
Murray	Nault
Ng	O'Connell
Oliphant	Oliver
O'Regan	Ouellette
Paradis	Peschisolido
Peterson	Petitpas Taylor
Philpott	Picard
Poissant	Quach
Qualtrough	Ramsey
Ratansi	Rioux
Robillard	Rodriguez
Rogers	Romanado
Rudd	Rumiy
Sahota	Saini
Sajjan	Samson
Sangha	Sarai

Scarpaleggia
Schulte
Sgro
Sheehan
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Simms
Sorbara
Tabbara
Tassi
Trudel
Vandenbeld
Whalen
Wrzesnewskyj
Young 181

Schiefke
Serré
Shanahan
Sidhu (Mission Matsqui Fraser Canyon)
Sikand
Sohi
Spengemann
Tan
Trudeau
Vandal
Vaughan
Wilson-Raybould
Yip

NAYS

Members

Aboultaif
Albrecht
Anderson
Barsalou-Duval
Bergen
Boudrias
Chong
Cooper
Diotte
Dreeshen
Falk (Battlefords Lloydminster)
Finley
Gallant
Godin
Harder
Jeneroux
Kent
Kmiec
Lake
Leitch
Lloyd
Lukiwski
Marcil
McLeod (Kamloops Thompson Cariboo)
Nater
Obhrai
Paul-Hus
Poilievre
Rempel
Saroya
Shields
Sorenson
Strahl
Thériault
Trost
Viersen
Warawa
Waugh
Wong
Zimmer 79

Albas
Allison
Barlow
Benzen
Blaney (Bellechasse Les Etchemins Lévis)
Brassard
Clarke
Deltell
Doherty
Eglinski
Fast
Fortin
Genuis
Gourde
Hoback
Kelly
Kitchen
Kusie
Lauzon (Stormont Dundas South Glengarry)
Liepert
Lobb
MacKenzie
McCauley (Edmonton West)
Motz
Nuttall
O'Toole
Pauzé
Reid
Richards
Schmale
Shipley
Ste-Marie
Stubbs
Tilson
Van Loan
Wagantall
Warkentin
Webber
Yurdiga

PAIRED

Members

Beaulieu Gill
Massé (Avignon La Mitis Matane Matapédia)
Plamondon
Wilkinson Zahid 6

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 6 carried.

[*Translation*]

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 1— ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AGENCY OF CANADA FOR THE REGIONS OF QUEBEC

Hon. Scott Brison (President of the Treasury Board, Lib.) moved: That Vote 1, in the amount of $38,634,370, under Economic Development Agency of Canada for the Regions of Quebec—Operating expenditures, in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2019, be concurred in.

The Speaker: The question is on Motion No. 7. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And five or more members having risen:

● (2330)

(The House divided on Motion No. 7, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 768)

YEAS

Members

Aldag
Allesley
Anandasangaree
Arya
Aubin
Badawey
Bains
Beech
Bibeau
Blair
Boissonnault
Boutin-Sweet
Breton
Brosseau
Caron
Casey (Charlottetown)
Champagne
Choquette
Cuzner
Damoff
Dhaliwal
Drouin
Dubourg
Duguid
Duvall
Easter
El-Khoury
Erskine-Smith
Eyolfson
Fillmore
Fonseca
Fragiskatos
Fraser (Central Nova)
Fuhr
Garrison
Goldsmith-Jones
Gould
Grewal
Harvey
Hehr
Holland
Hussen
Iacono
Joly
Jowhari
Khera
Lambropoulos
Lamoureux
Lauzon (Argenteuil La Petite-Nation)
Leslie
Lightbound
Long
Ludwig

Alghabra
Amos
Arseneault
Ashton
Ayoub
Bagnell
Baylis
Bennett
Blaikie
Blaney (North Island Powell River)
Bossio
Bratina
Brison
Caesar-Chavannes
Casey (Cumberland Colchester)
Chagger
Chen
Commer
Dabrusin
DeCourcey
Dhillon
Dubé
Duclos
Duncan (Edmonton Strathcona)
Dzerowicz
Ehsassi
Ellis
Eyking
Fergus
Fisher
Fortier
Fraser (West Nova)
Fry
Garneau
Gerretsen
Goodale
Graham
Hajdu
Hébert
Hogg
Housefather
Hutchings
Johns
Jones
Khalid
Kwan
Lametti
Lapointe
Lebouthillier
Levitt
Lockhart
Longfield
MacGregor

MacKinnon (Gatineau)	Malcolmson
Maloney	Masse (Windsor West)
Mathyssen	May (Cambridge)
McCrimmon	McGuinty
McKay	McKenna
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)	McLeod (Northwest Territories)
Mendès	Mendicino
Mihychuk	Miller (Ville Marie—Le Sud Ouest—Île des Soeurs)
Monsef	Murray
Nault	Ng
O'Connell	Oliphant
Oliver	O'Regan
Ouellette	Paradis
Peschisolido	Peterson
Petitpas Taylor	Philpott
Picard	Poissant
Quach	Qualtrough
Ramsey	Ratansi
Rioux	Robillard
Rodriguez	Rogers
Romanado	Rudd
Ruimy	Sahota
Saini	Sajjan
Samson	Sangha
Sarai	Scarpaleggia
Schiefke	Schulte
Serré	Sgro
Shanahan	Sheehan
Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)	Sidhu (Brampton South)
Sikand	Simms
Sohi	Sorbara
Spengemann	Tabbara
Tan	Tassi
Trudeau	Trudel
Vandal	Vandenbeld
Vaughan	Whalen
Wilson-Raybould	Wrzesnewskyj
Yip	Young — 182

NAYS

Members

Aboultaif	Albas
Albrecht	Allison
Anderson	Barlow
Barsalou-Duval	Benzen
Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis)	Boudrias
Brassard	Chong
Clarke	Cooper
Deltell	Diotte
Doherty	Dreeshen
Eglinski	Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Fast	Finley
Fortin	Gallant
Genuis	Godin
Gourde	Harder
Hoback	Jeneroux
Kelly	Kent
Kitchen	Kmiec
Kusie	Lake
Lauzon (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)	Leitch
Lloyd	Lobb
Lukiwski	MacKenzie
Marcil	McCauley (Edmonton West)
McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)	Motz
Nater	Nuttall
Obhrai	O'Toole
Paul-Hus	Pauzé
Poilievre	Reid
Rempel	Richards
Saroya	Schmale
Shields	Shipley
Sorenson	Ste-Marie
Strahl	Stubbs
Thériault	Tilson
Trost	Van Loan
Wagantall	Warawa
Warkentin	Waugh
Webber	Wong
Yurdiga	Zimmer — 76

PAIRED

Members

Beaulieu	Gill
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)	
Plamondon	
Wilkinson	Zahid — 6

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 7 carried.

[*English*]

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 5—ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AGENCY OF CANADA FOR THE REGIONS OF QUEBEC

Hon. Scott Brison (President of the Treasury Board, Lib.) moved:

That Vote 5, in the amount of $233,365,446, under Economic Development Agency of Canada for the Regions of Quebec—Grants and contributions, in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2019, be concurred in.

The Speaker: The next question is on Motion No. 8. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And five or more members having risen:

● (2335)

(The House divided on Motion No. 8, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 769)

YEAS

Members

Aldag	Alghabra
Allesley	Amos
Anandasangaree	Arseneault
Arya	Ashton
Aubin	Ayoub
Badawey	Bagnell
Bains	Barsalou-Duval
Baylis	Beech
Bennett	Bibeau
Blaikie	Blair
Blaney (North Island—Powell River)	Boissonnault
Bossio	Boudrias
Boutin-Sweet	Bratina
Breton	Brison
Brosseau	Caesar-Chavannes
Caron	Casey (Cumberland—Colchester)
Casey (Charlottetown)	Chagger
Champagne	Chen
Choquette	Cormier
Cuzner	Dabrusin
Damoff	DeCourcey
Dhaliwal	Dhillon
Drouin	Dubé
Dubourg	Duclos
Duguid	Duncan (Edmonton Strathcona)
Duvall	Dzerowicz
Easter	Ehsassi

El Khoury
Erskine-Smith
Eyolfson
Fillmore
Fonseca
Fortin
Fraser (West Nova)
Fry
Garneau
Gerretsen
Goodale
Graham
Hajdu
Hébert
Hogg
Housefather
Hutchings
Johns
Jones
Khalid
Kwan
Lametti
Lapointe
Lebouthillier
Levitt
Lockhart
Longfield
MacGregor
Malcolmson
Marcil
Mathyssen
McCrimmon
McKay
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
Mendès
Mihychuk
Monsef
Nault
O'Connell
Oliver
Ouellette
Pauzé
Peterson
Philpott
Poissant
Qualtrough
Ratansi
Robillard
Rogers
Rudd
Sahota
Sajjan
Sangha
Scarpaleggia
Schulte
Sgro
Sheehan
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Simms
Sorbara
Ste-Marie
Tan
Thériault
Trudel
Vandenbeld
Whalen
Wrzesnewskyj
Young — 189

Ellis
Eyking
Fergus
Fisher
Fortier
Fragiskatos
Fraser (Central Nova)
Fuhr
Garrison
Goldsmith-Jones
Gould
Grewal
Harvey
Hehr
Holland
Hussen
Iacono
Joly
Jowhari
Khera
Lambropoulos
Lamoureux
Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation)
Leslie
Lightbound
Long
Ludwig
MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Maloney
Masse (Windsor West)
May (Cambridge)
McGuinty
McKenna
McLeod (Northwest Territories)
Mendicino
Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île-des-Sœurs)
Murray
Ng
Oliphant
O'Regan
Paradis
Peschisolido
Petitpas Taylor
Picard
Quach
Ramsey
Rioux
Rodriguez
Romanado
Ruimy
Saini
Samson
Sarai
Schiefke
Serré
Shanahan
Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)
Sikand
Sohi
Spengemann
Tabbara
Tassi
Trudeau
Vandal
Vaughan
Wilson-Raybould
Yip

NAYS

Members

Aboultaif
Albrecht
Anderson
Benzen
Brassard
Clarke
Deltell
Doherty
Eglinski
Fast
Albas
Allison
Barlow
Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis)
Chong
Cooper
Diotte
Dreeshen
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Finley
Gallant
Godin
Harder
Jeneroux
Kent
Kmiec
Lake
Leitch
Lobb
MacKenzie
McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)
Nater
O'Toole
Poilievre
Rempel
Saroya
Shields
Sorenson
Stubbs
Trost
Viersen
Warawa
Waugh
Wong
Zimmer — 69
Genuis
Gourde
Hoback
Kelly
Kitchen
Kusie
Lauzon (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)
Lloyd
Lukiwski
McCauley (Edmonton West)
Motz
Obhrai
Paul-Hus
Reid
Richards
Schmale
Shipley
Strahl
Tilson
Van Loan
Wagantall
Warkentin
Webber
Yurdiga

PAIRED

Members

Beaulieu—Gill
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)—Plamondon
Wilkinson—Zahid — 6

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 8 carried.

● (2340)

[*Translation*]

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 1—PUBLIC HEALTH AGENCY OF CANADA

Hon. Scott Brison (President of the Treasury Board, Lib.) moved:

That Vote 1, in the amount of $328,988,943, under Public Health Agency of Canada—Operating expenditures, in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2019, be concurred in.

The Speaker: The question is on Motion No. 9. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And five or more members having risen:

● (2345)

(The House divided on Motion No. 9, which was agreed to on the following division:)

Business of Supply

(Division No. 770)

YEAS

Members

Aldag
Alleslev
Anandasangaree
Arya
Aubin
Badawey
Bains
Beech
Bibeau
Blair
Boissonnault
Boutin-Sweet
Breton
Brosseau
Caron
Casey (Charlottetown)
Chen
Cormier
Dabrusin
DeCourcey
Dhillon
Dubé
Duclos
Duncan (Edmonton Strathcona)
Dzerowicz
Ehsassi
Ellis
Eyking
Fergus
Fisher
Fortier
Fraser (West Nova)
Fry
Garneau
Gerretsen
Goodale
Graham
Hajdu
Hébert
Hogg
Housefather
Hutchings
Johns
Jones
Khalid
Kwan
Lametti
Lapointe
Lebouthillier
Levitt
Lockhart
Longfield
MacGregor
Malcolmson
Masse (Windsor West)
May (Cambridge)
McGuinty
McKenna
McLeod (Northwest Territories)
Mendicino
Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île-des-Sœurs)
Monsef
Murray
Ng
Oliphant
O'Regan
Paradis
Peterson
Philpott
Poissant
Qualtrough
Ratansi
Robillard
Rogers
Rudd
Sahota
Sajjan
Sangha
Alghabra
Amos
Arseneault
Ashton
Ayoub
Bagnell
Baylis
Bennett
Blaikie
Blaney (North Island—Powell River)
Bossio
Bratina
Brison
Caesar-Chavannes
Casey (Cumberland—Colchester)
Champagne
Choquette
Cuzner
Damoff
Dhaliwal
Drouin
Dubourg
Duguid
Duvall
Easter
El-Khoury
Erskine-Smith
Eyolfson
Fillmore
Fonseca
Fragiskatos
Fraser (Central Nova)
Fuhr
Garrison
Goldsmith-Jones
Gould
Grewal
Harvey
Hehr
Holland
Hussen
Iacono
Joly
Jowhari
Khera
Lambropoulos
Lamoureux
Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation)
Leslie
Lightbound
Long
Ludwig
MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Maloney
Mathyssen
McCrimmon
McKay
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
Mendès
Mihychuk
Nault
O'Connell
Oliver
Ouellette
Peschisolido
Petitpas Taylor
Picard
Quach
Ramsey
Rioux
Rodriguez
Romanado
Ruimy
Saini
Samson
Sarai
Scarpaleggia
Schulte
Sgro
Sheehan
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Simms
Sorbara
Tabbara
Tassi
Trudel
Vandenbeld
Whalen
Wrzesnewskyj
Young — 181

Schiefke
Serré
Shanahan
Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)
Sikand
Sohi
Spengemann
Tan
Trudeau
Vandal
Vaughan
Wilson-Raybould
Yip

NAYS

Members

Aboultaif
Albrecht
Anderson
Barsalou-Duval
Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis)
Brassard
Clarke
Deltell
Doherty
Eglinski
Fast
Fortin
Genuis
Gourde
Hoback
Kelly
Kitchen
Kusie
Lauzon (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)
Lloyd
Lukiwski
Marcil
McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)
Nater
Obhrai
Paul-Hus
Poilievre
Rempel
Saroya
Shields
Sorenson
Stubbs
Tilson
Van Loan
Wagantall
Warkentin
Webber
Yurdiga

Albas
Allison
Barlow
Benzen
Boudrias
Chong
Cooper
Diotte
Dreeshen
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Finley
Gallant
Godin
Harder
Jeneroux
Kent
Kmiec
Lake
Leitch
Lobb
MacKenzie
McCauley (Edmonton West)
Motz
Nuttall
O'Toole
Pauzé
Reid
Richards
Schmale
Shipley
Ste-Marie
Thériault
Trost
Viersen
Warawa
Waugh
Wong
Zimmer — 76

PAIRED

Members

Beaulieu — Gill
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia) — Plamondon
Wilkinson — Zahid — 6

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 9 carried.

● (2350)

[*English*]

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 5—PUBLIC HEALTH AGENCY OF CANADA

Hon. Scott Brison (President of the Treasury Board, Lib.) moved:

That Vote 5, in the amount of $5,862,750, under Public Health Agency of Canada —Capital expenditures, in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2019, be concurred in.

The Speaker: The question is on Motion No. 10. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And five or more members having risen:

(The House divided on Motion No. 10, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 771)

YEAS

Members

Aldag
Allesley
Anandasangaree
Arya
Aubin
Badawey
Bains
Beech
Bibeau
Blair
Boissonnault
Boutin-Sweet
Breton
Brosseau
Caron
Casey (Charlottetown)
Chen
Cormier
Dabrusin
DeCourcey
Dhillon
Dubé
Duclos
Duncan (Edmonton Strathcona)
Dzerowicz
Ehsassi
Ellis
Eyking
Fergus
Fisher
Fortier
Fraser (West Nova)
Fry
Gameau
Gerretsen
Goodale
Graham
Hajdu
Hébert
Hogg
Housefather
Hutchings
Johns
Jones
Khalid
Kwan
Lametti
Lapointe
Lebouthillier
Levitt
Lockhart
Longfield
MacGregor
Malcolmson
Masse (Windsor West)
Alghabra
Amos
Arseneault
Ashton
Ayoub
Bagnell
Baylis
Bennett
Blaikie
Blaney (North Island—Powell River)
Bossio
Bratina
Brison
Caesar-Chavannes
Casey (Cumberland—Colchester)
Champagne
Choquette
Cuzner
Damoff
Dhaliwal
Drouin
Dubourg
Duguid
Duvall
Easter
El-Khoury
Erskine-Smith
Eyolfson
Fillmore
Fonseca
Fragiskatos
Fraser (Central Nova)
Fuhr
Garrison
Goldsmith-Jones
Gould
Grewal
Harvey
Hehr
Holland
Hussen
Iacono
Joly
Jowhari
Khera
Lambropoulos
Lamoureux
Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation)
Leslie
Lightbound
Long
Ludwig
MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Maloney
Mathyssen
May (Cambridge)
McGuinty
McKenna
McLeod (Northwest Territories)
Mendicino
Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île-des-Sœurs)
Monsef
Murray
Ng
Oliphant
O'Regan
Paradis
Peterson
Philpott
Poissant
Qualtrough
Ratansi
Robillard
Rogers
Rudd
Sahota
Sajjan
Sangha
Scarpaleggia
Schulte
Sgro
Sheehan
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Simms
Sorbara
Tabbara
Tassi
Trudel
Vandenbeld
Whalen
Wrzesnewskyj
Young — 181

McCrimmon
McKay
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
Mendès
Mihychuk
Nault
O'Connell
Oliver
Ouellette
Peschisolido
Petitpas Taylor
Picard
Quach
Ramsey
Rioux
Rodriguez
Romanado
Rumy
Saini
Samson
Sarai
Schiefke
Serré
Shanahan
Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)
Sikand
Sohi
Spengemann
Tan
Trudeau
Vandal
Vaughan
Wilson-Raybould
Yip

NAYS

Members

Aboultaif
Albrecht
Anderson
Barsalou-Duval
Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis)
Brassard
Clarke
Deltell
Doherty
Eglinski
Fast
Fortin
Genuis
Gourde
Hoback
Kelly
Kitchen
Kusie
Lauzon (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)
Lloyd
Lukiwski
Marcil
McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)
Nater
Obhrai
Paul-Hus
Poilievre
Rempel
Saroya
Shields
Sorenson
Stubbs
Tilson
Van Loan
Wagantall
Warkentin
Webber
Yurdiga
Albas
Allison
Barlow
Benzen
Boudrias
Chong
Cooper
Diotte
Dreeshen
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Finley
Gallant
Godin
Harder
Jeneroux
Kent
Kmiec
Lake
Leitch
Lobb
MacKenzie
McCauley (Edmonton West)
Motz
Nuttall
O'Toole
Pauzé
Reid
Richards
Schmale
Shipley
Ste-Marie
Thériault
Trost
Viersen
Watawa
Waugh
Wong
Zimmer — 76

PAIRED

Members

Beaulieu — Gill
Massé (Avignon — La Mitis — Matane — Matapédia)
Plamondon
Wilkinson — Zahid — 6

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 10 carried.

[*Translation*]

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 10—PUBLIC HEALTH AGENCY OF CANADA

Hon. Scott Brison (President of the Treasury Board, Lib.) moved:

That Vote 10, in the amount of $211,843,231, under Public Health Agency of Canada—Grants and contributions, in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2019, be concurred in.

The Speaker: The question is on Motion No. 11. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And five or more members having risen:

● (0000)

(The House divided on Motion No. 11, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 772)

YEAS

Members

Aldag
Alleslev
Anandasangaree
Arya
Aubin
Badawey
Bains
Beech
Bibeau
Blair
Boissonnault
Boutin-Sweet
Breton
Brosseau
Caron
Casey (Charlottetown)
Chen
Cormier
Dabrusin
DeCourcey
Dhillon
Dubé
Duclos
Duncan (Edmonton Strathcona)
Dzerowicz
Ehsassi
Ellis
Eyking
Alghabra
Amos
Arseneault
Ashton
Ayoub
Bagnell
Baylis
Bennett
Blaikie
Blaney (North Island — Powell River)
Bossio
Bratina
Brison
Caesar-Chavannes
Casey (Cumberland — Colchester)
Champagne
Choquette
Cuzner
Damoff
Dhaliwal
Drouin
Dubourg
Duguid
Duvall
Easter
El-Khoury
Erskine-Smith
Eyolfson
Fergus
Fisher
Fortier
Fraser (West Nova)
Fry
Garneau
Gerretsen
Goodale
Graham
Hajdu
Hébert
Hogg
Housefather
Hutchings
Johns
Jones
Khalid
Kwan
Lametti
Lapointe
Lebouthillier
Levitt
Lockhart
Longfield
MacGregor
Malcolmson
Masse (Windsor West)
May (Cambridge)
McGuinty
McKenna
McLeod (Northwest Territories)
Mendicino
Miller (Ville-Marie — Le Sud-Ouest — Île-des-Sœurs)
Mousef
Murray
Ng
Oliphant
O'Regan
Paradis
Peterson
Philpott
Poissant
Qualtrough
Ratansi
Robillard
Rogers
Rudd
Sahota
Sajan
Sangha
Scarpaleggia
Schulte
Sgro
Sheehan
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Simms
Sorbara
Tabbara
Tassi
Trudel
Vandenbeld
Whalen
Wrzesnewskyj
Young — 181
Fillmore
Fonseca
Fragiskatos
Fraser (Central Nova)
Fuhr
Garrison
Goldsmith-Jones
Gould
Grewal
Harvey
Hehr
Holland
Hussen
Iacono
Joly
Jowhari
Khera
Lambropoulos
Lamoureux
Lauzon (Argenteuil — La Petite-Nation)
Leslie
Lightbound
Long
Ludwig
MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Maloney
Mathyssen
McCrimmon
McKay
McKinnon (Coquitlam — Port Coquitlam)
Mendès
Mihychuk
Nault
O'Connell
Oliver
Ouellette
Peschisolido
Petitpas Taylor
Picard
Quach
Ramsey
Rioux
Rodriguez
Romanado
Ruimy
Saini
Samson
Sarai
Schiefke
Serré
Shanahan
Sidhu (Mission — Matsqui — Fraser Canyon)
Sikand
Sohi
Spengemann
Tan
Trudeau
Vandal
Vaughan
Wilson-Raybould
Yip

NAYS

Members

Aboultaif
Albrecht
Anderson
Barsalou-Duval
Blaney (Bellechasse — Les Etchemins — Lévis)
Chong
Cooper
Diotte
Dreeshen
Falk (Battlefords — Lloydminster)
Finley
Gallant
Godin
Harder
Jeneroux
Albas
Allison
Barlow
Benzen
Brassard
Clarke
Deltell
Doherty
Eglinski
Fast
Fortin
Gennis
Gourde
Hoback
Kelly

Kent	Kitchen
Kmiec	Kusie
Lake	Lauzon (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)
Leitch	Lloyd
Lobb	Lukiwski
MacKenzie	Marcil
McCauley (Edmonton West)	McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)
Motz	Nater
Nuttall	Obhrai
O'Toole	Panzé
Poilievre	Reid
Rempel	Richards
Saroya	Schmale
Shields	Shipley
Sorenson	Ste-Marie
Stubbs	Thériault
Tilson	Trost
Van Loan	Viersen
Wagantall	Warawa
Warkentin	Waugh
Webber	Wong
Yurdiga	Zimmer — 74

PAIRED

Members

Beaulieu	Gill
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)	
Plamondon	
Wilkinson	Zahid — 6

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 11 carried.

● (0005)

[*English*]

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 1—ATLANTIC CANADA OPPORTUNITIES AGENCY

Hon. Scott Brison (President of the Treasury Board, Lib.) moved:

That Vote 1, in the amount of $66,292,642, under Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency—Operating expenditures, in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2019, be concurred in.

The Speaker: The question is on Motion No. 12. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And five or more members having risen:

(The House divided on Motion No. 12, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 773)

YEAS

Members

Aldag	Alghabra
Alleslev	Amos
Anandasangaree	Arseneault
Arya	Ashton
Aubin	Ayoub
Badawey	Bagnell
Bains	Baylis
Beech	Bennett
Bibeau	Blaikie
Blair	Blaney (North Island—Powell River)
Boissonnault	Bossio
Boutin-Sweet	Bratina
Breton	Brison
Caesar-Chavannes	Caron
Casey (Cumberland—Colchester)	Casey (Charlottetown)
Champagne	Chen
Choquette	Cormier
Cuzner	Dabrusin
Damoff	DeCourcey
Dhaliwal	Dhillon
Drouin	Dubourg
Duclos	Duguid
Duncan (Edmonton—Strathcona)	Duvall
Dzerowicz	Easter
El-Khoury	Ellis
Erskine-Smith	Eyking
Eyolfson	Fergus
Fillmore	Fisher
Fonseca	Fortier
Fragiskatos	Fraser (West Nova)
Fraser (Central Nova)	Fry
Fuhr	Garneau
Garrison	Gerretsen
Goldsmith-Jones	Goodale
Gould	Graham
Grewal	Hajdu
Harvey	Hébert
Hehr	Hogg
Holland	Housefather
Hussen	Hutchings
Iacono	Johns
Joly	Jones
Khalid	Khera
Kwan	Lambropoulos
Lametti	Lamoureux
Lapointe	Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation)
Lebouthillier	Leslie
Levitt	Lightbound
Lockhart	Long
Longfield	Ludwig
MacGregor	MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Malcolmson	Maloney
Masse (Windsor West)	Mathyssen
May (Cambridge)	McCrimmon
McGuinty	McKay
McKenna	McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
McLeod (Northwest Territories)	Mendès
Mendicino	Mihychuk
Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île-des-Soeurs)	
Monsef	
Murray	Nault
Ng	O'Connell
Oliphant	Oliver
O'Regan	Ouellette
Paradis	Peschisolido
Peterson	Petitpas Taylor
Philpott	Picard
Poissant	Quach
Qualtrough	Ramsey
Rioux	Robillard
Rodriguez	Rogers
Romanado	Rudd
Ruimy	Sahota
Saini	Sajjan
Samson	Sangha
Sarai	Scarpaleggia
Schiefke	Schulte
Serré	Sgro
Shanahan	Sheehan
Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)	Sidhu (Brampton South)
Sikand	Simms
Sohi	Sorbara
Spengemann	Tabbara
Tan	Tassi
Trudel	Vandal
Vandenbeld	Vaughan
Whalen	Wilson-Raybould

Wrzesnewskyj — Yip
Young — 175

NAYS

Members

Aboultaif — Albas
Albrecht — Allison
Anderson — Barlow
Barsalou-Duval — Benzen
Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis) — Brassard
Chong — Clarke
Cooper — Deltell
Diotte — Doherty
Dreeshen — Eglinski
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster) — Fast
Finley — Fortin
Gallant — Genuis
Godin — Gourde
Harder — Hoback
Jeneroux — Kelly
Kent — Kitchen
Kmiec — Kusie
Lake — Lauzon (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)
Leitch — Lloyd
Lobb — Lukiwski
MacKenzie — Marcil
McCauley (Edmonton West) — McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)
Motz — Nater
Nuttall — Obhrai
O'Toole — Paul-Hus
Pauzé — Poilievre
Reid — Rempel
Richards — Saroya
Schmale — Shields
Shipley — Sorenson
Ste-Marie — Stubbs
Thériault — Tilson
Trost — Van Loan
Viersen — Wagantall
Warawa — Warkentin
Waugh — Webber
Wong — Yurdiga
Zimmer — 75

PAIRED

Members

Beaulieu — Gill
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)
Plamondon
Wilkinson — Zahid — 6

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 12 carried.

[*Translation*]

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 5—ATLANTIC CANADA OPPORTUNITIES AGENCY

Hon. Scott Brison (President of the Treasury Board, Lib.) moved:

That Vote 5, in the amount of $252,896,893, under Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency—Grants and contributions, in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2019, be concurred in.

The Speaker: The question is on Motion No. 13. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And five or more members having risen:

● (0015)

(The House divided on Motion No. 13, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 774)

YEAS

Members

Aldag — Alghabra
Allesley — Amos
Anandasangaree — Arseneault
Arya — Ashton
Aubin — Ayoub
Badawey — Bagnell
Baylis — Beech
Bennett — Bibeau
Blaikie — Blair
Blaney (North Island—Powell River) — Boissonnault
Bossio — Boulerice
Boutin-Sweet — Bratina
Breton — Brison
Caesar-Chavannes — Caron
Casey (Cumberland—Colchester) — Casey (Charlottetown)
Champagne — Chen
Choquette — Cormier
Cuzner — Dabrusin
Damoff — DeCourcey
Dhaliwal — Dhillon
Drouin — Dubourg
Duclos — Duguid
Duncan (Edmonton—Strathcona) — Dzerowicz
Easter — Ehsassi
El-Khoury — Ellis
Erskine-Smith — Eyking
Eyolfson — Fergus
Fillmore — Fisher
Fonseca — Fortier
Fragiskatos — Fraser (West Nova)
Fraser (Central Nova) — Fry
Fuhr — Garneau
Garrison — Gerretsen
Goldsmith-Jones — Goodale
Gould — Graham
Grewal — Hajdu
Harvey — Hébert
Hehr — Hogg
Holland — Housefather
Hutchings — Iacono
Johns — Joly
Jones — Khalid
Khera — Kwan
Lambropoulos — Lametti
Lamoureux — Lapointe
Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation) — Lebouthillier
Leslie — Levitt
Lightbound — Lockhart
Long — Longfield
Ludwig — MacGregor
MacKinnon (Gatineau) — Malcolmson
Maloney — Masse (Windsor West)
Mathyssen — May (Cambridge)
McCrimmon — McGuinty
McKay — McKenna
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam) — McLeod (Northwest Territories)
Mendès — Mendicino
Mihychuk — Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île-des-Sœurs)
Monsef — Murray
Nault — Ng
O'Connell — Oliphant
Oliver — O'Regan
Ouellette — Paradis
Peschisolido — Peterson
Petitpas Taylor — Philpott

Picard	Poissant
Quach	Qualtrough
Ramsey	Rioux
Robillard	Rodriguez
Rogers	Romanado
Rudd	Ruimy
Sahota	Saini
Sajjan	Samson
Sangha	Sarai
Scarpaleggia	Schiefke
Schulte	Serré
Sgro	Shanahan
Sheehan	Sidhu (Mission — Matsqui — Fraser Canyon)
Sidhu (Brampton South)	Sikand
Simms	Sohi
Sorbara	Spengemann
Tabbara	Tan
Tassi	Trudel
Vandal	Vandenbeld
Vaughan	Whalen
Wilson-Raybould	Wrzesnewskyj
Yip	Young — 174

NAYS

Members

Aboultaif	Albas
Albrecht	Allison
Anderson	Barlow
Barsalou-Duval	Benzen
Blaney (Bellechasse — Les Etchemins — Lévis)	Brassard
Chong	Clarke
Cooper	Diotte
Doherty	Dreeshen
Eglinski	Falk (Battlefords — Lloydminster)
Fast	Finley
Fortin	Gallant
Genuis	Godin
Gourde	Harder
Hoback	Jeneroux
Kelly	Kent
Kitchen	Kmiec
Kusie	Lake
Lauzon (Stormont — Dundas — South Glengarry)	Leitch
Lloyd	Lobb
Lukiwski	MacKenzie
Marcil	McCauley (Edmonton West)
McLeod (Kamloops — Thompson — Cariboo)	Motz
Nantel	Nater
Nuttall	Obhrai
O'Toole	Paul-Hus
Pauzé	Poilievre
Reid	Rempel
Richards	Saroya
Scheer	Schmale
Shields	Shipley
Sorenson	Ste-Marie
Strahl	Stubbs
Thériault	Tilson
Trost	Van Loan
Viersen	Wagantall
Warawa	Warkentin
Waugh	Webber
Wong	Yurdiga
Zimmer — 77	

PAIRED

Members

Beaulieu	Gill
Massé (Avignon — La Mitis — Matane — Matapédia)	
Plamondon	
Wilkinson	Zahid — 6

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 13 carried.

Business of Supply

[English]

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 1—FEDERAL ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AGENCY FOR SOUTHERN ONTARIO

Hon. Scott Brison (President of the Treasury Board, Lib.) moved:

That Vote 1, in the amount of $25,158,031, under Federal Economic Development Agency for Southern Ontario—Operating expenditures, in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2019, be concurred in.

The Speaker: The question is on Motion No. 14. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And five or more members having risen:

● (0020)

(The House divided on the Motion No. 14, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 775)

YEAS

Members

Aldag	Alghabra
Alleslev	Amos
Anandasangaree	Arseneault
Arya	Ashton
Aubin	Ayoub
Badawey	Bagnell
Bains	Baylis
Beech	Bennett
Bibeau	Blaikie
Blair	Blaney (North Island — Powell River)
Boissonnault	Bossio
Boulerice	Boutin-Sweet
Bratina	Breton
Brison	Caesar-Chavannes
Caron	Casey (Cumberland — Colchester)
Casey (Charlottetown)	Champagne
Chen	Choquette
Cormier	Cuzner
Dabrusin	Damoff
DeCourcey	Dhaliwal
Dhillon	Dubourg
Duclos	Duguid
Duncan (Edmonton—Strathcona)	Duvall
Dzerowicz	Easter
Ehsassi	El-Khoury
Ellis	Erskine-Smith
Eyking	Eyolfson
Fergus	Fillmore
Fisher	Fonseca
Fortier	Fragiskatos
Fraser (West Nova)	Fraser (Central Nova)
Fry	Fuhr
Gameau	Garrison
Gerretsen	Goldsmith-Jones
Goodale	Gould
Graham	Grewal
Hajdu	Harvey

Hébert
Hogg
Hutchings
Johns
Jones
Khera
Lambropoulos
Lamoureux
Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation)
Leslie
Lightbound
Long
Ludwig
MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Maloney
Mathyssen
McCrimmon
McKay
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
Mendès
Mihychuk
Monsef
Nault
O'Connell
Oliver
Ouellette
Peschisolido
Petitpas Taylor
Picard
Quach
Ramsey
Robillard
Rogers
Ruimy
Saini
Samson
Sarai
Schiefke
Serré
Shanahan
Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)
Sikand
Sohi
Spengemann
Tan
Trudel
Vandenbeld
Whalen
Wrzesnewskyj
Young — 173

Hehr
Housefather
Iacono
Joly
Khalid
Kwan
Lametti
Lapointe
Lebouthillier
Levitt
Lockhart
Longfield
MacGregor
Malcolmson
Masse (Windsor West)
May (Cambridge)
McGuinty
McKenna
McLeod (Northwest Territories)
Mendicino
Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île-des-Sœurs)
Murray
Ng
Oliphant
O'Regan
Paradis
Peterson
Philpott
Poissant
Qualtrough
Rioux
Rodriguez
Rudd
Sahota
Sajjan
Sangha
Scarpaleggia
Schulte
Sgro
Sheehan
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Simms
Sorbara
Tabbara
Tassi
Vandal
Vaughan
Wilson-Raybould
Yip

NAYS

Members

Aboultaif
Albrecht
Barlow
Benzen
Boudrias
Chong
Cooper
Doherty
Eglinski
Fast
Fortin
Genuis
Gourde
Hoback
Kelly
Kitchen
Kusie
Lauzon (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)
Lloyd
Lukiwski
Marcil
McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)
Nater
O'Toole
Pauzé
Reid
Richards
Scheer

Albas
Allison
Barsalou-Duval
Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Levis)
Brassard
Clarke
Diotte
Deeshen
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Finley
Gallant
Godin
Harder
Jeneroux
Kent
Kmiec
Lake
Leitch
Lobb
MacKenzie
McCauley (Edmonton West)
Motz
Nuttall
Paul-Hus
Poilievre
Rempel
Saroya
Schmale

Shields
Sorenson
Strahl
Thériault
Trost
Viersen
Warkentin
Webber
Yurdiga

Shipley
Ste-Marie
Stubbs
Tilson
Van Loan
Wagantall
Waugh
Wong
Zimmer — 74

PAIRED

Members

Beaulieu — Gill
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)—Plamondon
Wilkinson — Zahid — 6

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 14 carried.

[Translation]

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 5—FEDERAL ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AGENCY FOR SOUTHERN ONTARIO

Hon. Scott Brison (President of the Treasury Board, Lib.) moved:

That Vote 5, in the amount of $159,188,390, under Federal Economic Development Agency for Southern Ontario—Grants and contributions, in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2019, be concurred in.

The Speaker: The question is on Motion No. 15. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And five or more members having risen:

● (0030)

(The House divided on Motion No. 15, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 776)

YEAS

Members

Aldag
Alleslev
Anandasangaree
Arya
Aubin
Badawey
Bains
Beech
Bibeau
Blair
Boissonnault
Bourdeice
Bratina
Brison
Caron
Casey (Charlottetown)
Chen

Alghabra
Amos
Arseneault
Ashton
Ayoub
Bagnell
Baylis
Bennett
Blaikie
Blaney (North Island—Powell River)
Bossio
Boutin-Sweet
Breton
Caesar-Chavannes
Casey (Cumberland—Colchester)
Champagne
Choquette

Cormier
Dabrusin
DeCourcey
Dhillon
Duclos
Duncan (Edmonton Strathcona)
Dzerowicz
Ehsassi
Ellis
Eyking
Fergus
Fisher
Fortier
Fraser (West Nova)
Fry
Garneau
Gerretsen
Goodale
Graham
Hajdu
Hébert
Hogg
Housefather
Iacono
Joly
Khera
Lambropoulos
Lamoureux
Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation)
Leslie
Lightbound
Long
Ludwig
MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Maloney
Mathyssen
McCrimmon
McKay
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
Mendès
Mihychuk
Monsef
Ng
Oliphant
O'Regan
Paradis
Peterson
Philpott
Poissant
Qualtrough
Rioux
Rodriguez
Romanado
Ruimy
Sahota
Samson
Sarai
Schiefke
Serré
Shanahan
Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)
Sikand
Sohi
Spengemann
Tan
Trudel
Vandenbeld
Whalen
Wrzesnewskyj
Young — 173

Cuzner
Damoff
Dhaliwal
Dubourg
Duguid
Duvall
Easter
El-Khoury
Erskine-Smith
Eyolfson
Fillmore
Fonseca
Fragiskatos
Fraser (Central Nova)
Fuhr
Garrison
Goldsmith-Jones
Gould
Grewal
Harvey
Hehr
Holland
Hutchings
Johns
Jones
Kwan
Lametti
Lapointe
Lebouthillier
Levitt
Lockhart
Longfield
MacGregor
Malcolmson
Masse (Windsor West)
May (Cambridge)
McGuinty
McKenna
McLeod (Northwest Territories)
Mendicino
Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île-des-Soeurs)
Murray
O'Connell
Oliver
Ouellette
Peschisolido
Petitpas Taylor
Picard
Quach
Ramsey
Robillard
Rogers
Rudd
Sahota
Sajjan
Sangha
Scarpaleggia
Schulte
Sgro
Sheehan
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Simms
Sorbara
Tabbara
Tassi
Vandal
Vaughan
Wilson-Raybould
Yip

NAYS

Members

Aboultaif
Albrecht
Anderson
Barsalou-Duval
Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis)
Brassard
Clarke
Diotte

Albas
Allison
Barlow
Benzen
Boudrias
Chong
Cooper
Doherty

Dreeshen
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Finley
Gallant
Godin
Harder
Jeneroux
Kent
Kmiec
Lake
Lloyd
Lukiwski
McCauley (Edmonton West)
Motz
Nuttall
Paul-Hus
Reid
Richards
Scheer
Shields
Sorenson
Strahl
Thériault
Van Loan
Wagantall
Waugh
Wong
Zimmer — 71

Eglinski
Fast
Fortin
Genuis
Gourde
Hoback
Kelly
Kitchen
Kusie
Leitch
Lobb
Marcil
McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)
Nater
O'Toole
Pauzé
Rempel
Saroya
Schmale
Shipley
Ste-Marie
Stubbs
Trost
Viersen
Warkentin
Webber
Yurdiga

PAIRED

Members

Beaulieu — Gill
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia) — Plamondon
Wilkinson — Zahid — 6

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 15 carried.

[*English*]

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 1—CANADIAN SPACE AGENCY

Hon. Scott Brison (President of the Treasury Board, Lib.): moved:

That Vote 1, in the amount of $170,769,731, under Canadian Space Agency—Operating expenditures, in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2019, be concurred in.

The Deputy Speaker: The question is on Motion No. 16. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Deputy Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And five or more members having risen:

● (0035)

(The House divided on Motion No. 16, which was agreed to on the following division:)

Business of Supply

(Division No. 777)

YEAS

Members

Aldag
Alleslev
Anandasangaree
Aubin
Bains
Bennett
Bhatia
Blaney (North Island—Powell River)
Bossio
Boutin-Sweet
Breton
Caesar-Chavannes
Casey (Cumberland—Colchester)
Champagne
Choquette
Cuzner
Dabrusin
Damoff
Dhaliwal
Dubourg
Duguid
Duvall
Easter
El-Khoury
Erskine-Smith
Eyolfson
Fillmore
Fonseca
Fragiskatos
Fraser (Central Nova)
Fuhr
Garrison
Goldsmith-Jones
Gould
Grewal
Harvey
Hehr
Holland
Hutchings
Joly
Khera
Lambropoulos
Lamoureux
Leslie
Lockhart
Longfield
MacGregor
Maloney
Mathyssen
McCrimmon
McKay
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
Mendès
Mihychuk
Soeurs)
Monsef
Ng
Oliphant
O'Regan
Paradis
Peterson
Philpott
Poissant
Qualtrough
Rioux
Rogers
Rumny
Saini
Samson
Sarai
Schiefke
Serré
Sheehan
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Simms
Sorbara
Tabbara
Tassi
Trudel
Vandenbeld
Whalen
Wrzesnewskyj
Young — 161

Alghabra
Amos
Ashton
Bagnell
Beech
Bibeau
Blair
Boissonnault
Boulerice
Bratina
Brison
Caron
Casey (Charlottetown)
Chen
Cormier
Dabrusin
DeCourcey
Dhillon
Duclos
Duncan (Edmonton Strathcona)
Dzerowicz
Ehsassi
Ellis
Eyking
Fergus
Fisher
Fortier
Fraser (West Nova)
Fry
Garneau
Gerretsen
Goodale
Graham
Hajdu
Hébert
Hogg
Housefather
Johns
Jones
Kwan
Lametti
Lebouthillier
Lightbound
Long
Ludwig
Malcolmson
Masse (Windsor West)
May (Cambridge)
McGuinty
McKenna
McLeod (Northwest Territories)
Mendicino
Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île-des-

Murray
O'Connell
Oliver
Ouellette
Peschisolido
Petitpas Taylor
Picard
Quach
Ramsey
Robillard
Rudd
Sahota
Sajjan
Sangha
Scarpaleggia
Schulte
Shanahan
Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)
Sikand
Sohi
Spengemann
Tan
Trudeau
Vandal
Vaughan
Wilson-Raybould
Yip

NAYS

Members

Aboultaif
Albrecht
Anderson
Barsalou-Duval
Bergen
Boudrias
Chong
Cooper
Doherty
Eglinski
Fast
Fortin
Godin
Harder
Kelly
Kitchen
Kusie
Leitch
Lobb
Marcil
McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)
Nater
O'Toole
Pauzé
Reid
Richards
Scheer
Shields
Sorenson
Strahl
Thériault
Van Loan
Wagantall
Waugh
Wong

Albas
Allison
Barlow
Benzen
Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis)
Brassard
Clarke
Dutte
Dreeshen
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Finley
Gennis
Gourde
Jeneroux
Kent
Kmiec
Lake
Lloyd
Lukiwski
McCauley (Edmonton West)
Motz
Nuttall
Paul-Hus
Poilievre
Rempel
Saroya
Schmale
Shipley
Ste-Marie
Stubbs
Trost
Viersen
Warkentin
Webber
Yurdiga — 70

PAIRED

Members

Beaulieu—Gill
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)—Plamondon
Wilkinson—Zahid — 6

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 16 carried.

[*Translation*]

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 5—CANADIAN SPACE AGENCY

Hon. Scott Brison (President of the Treasury Board, Lib.) moved:

That Vote 5, in the amount of $112,229,000, under Canadian Space Agency—Capital expenditures, in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2019, be concurred in.

The Deputy Speaker: The question is on Motion No. 17. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Deputy Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And five or more members having risen:

● (0045)

The House divided on Motion No. 17, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 778)

YEAS

Members

Aldag
Alleslev
Anandasangaree
Aubin
Bains
Bennett
Blaikie
Blaney (North Island—Powell River)
Bossio
Boutin-Sweet
Breton
Caesar-Chavannes
Casey (Cumberland—Colchester)
Champagne
Choquette
Cuzner
Damoff
Dhaliwal
Drouin
Duclos
Duncan (Edmonton Strathcona)
Dzerowicz
Ehsassi
Ellis
Eyking
Fergus
Fisher
Fortier
Fraser (West Nova)
Fry
Garneau
Gerretsen
Goodale
Graham
Hajdu
Hébert
Holland
Hutchings
Joly
Khera
Lambropoulos
Lamoureux
Leslie
Lockhart
Longfield
MacGregor
Maloney
Mathyssen
McCrimmon
McKay
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
Mendès
Mihychuk
Socuts)
Monsef
Ng
Oliphant
Ouellette
Peschisolido
Petitpas Taylor
Picard
Quach
Ramsey
Robillard
Rudd
Sahota
Sajjan
Sangha
Scarpaleggia
Serré
Shanahan
Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)
Sikand
Sorbara
Tabbara
Tassi
Trudel
Vandenbeld
Whalen
Wrzesnewsky)
Young 159

Alghabra
Amos
Ashton
Bagnell
Beech
Bibeau
Blair
Bonsonnault
Boulerice
Bratina
Brison
Caron
Casey (Charlottetown)
Chen
Cormier
Dabrusin
DeCourcey
Dhillon
Dubourg
Duguid
Duvall
Easter
El-Khoury
Erskine-Smith
Eyolfson
Fillmore
Fonseca
Fragiskatos
Fraser (Central Nova)
Fuhr
Garrison
Goldsmith-Jones
Gould
Grewal
Harvey
Hogg
Housefather
Johns
Jones
Kwan
Lametti
Lebouthillier
Lightbound
Long
Ludwig
Malcolmson
Masse (Windsor West)
May (Cambridge)
McGuinty
McKenna
McLeod (Northwest Territories)
Mendicino
Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île des

Murray
O'Connell
Oliver
Paradis
Peterson
Philpott
Poissant
Qualtrough
Rioux
Rogers
Rumny
Saini
Samson
Sarai
Schulte
Sgro
Sheehan
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Sohi
Spengemann
Tan
Trudeau
Vandal
Vaughan
Wilson-Raybould
Yip

NAYS

Members

Aboultaif
Albrecht
Anderson
Barsalou-Duval
Bergen
Boudrias
Chong
Cooper
Doherty
Eglinski
Fortin
Genuis
Harder
Kelly
Kitchen
Kusie
Leitch
Lobb
Marcil
McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)
Nater
O'Toole
Pauzé
Reid
Richards
Scheer
Shields
Sorenson
Stubbs
Trost
Viersen
Warkentin
Webber
Yurdiga 67

Albas
Allison
Barlow
Benzen
Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis)
Brassard
Clarke
Diotte
Dreeshen
Fast
Gallant
Godin
Jeneroux
Kent
Kmiec
Lake
Lloyd
Lukiwski
McCauley (Edmonton West)
Motz
Nuttall
Paul-Hus
Poilievre
Rempel
Saroya
Schmale
Shipley
Ste-Marie
Thériault
Van Loan
Wagantall
Waugh
Wong

PAIRED

Members

Beaulieu
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)
Plamondon
Wilkinson

Gill

Zahid 6

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 17 carried.

[*English*]

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 10—CANADIAN SPACE AGENCY

Hon. Scott Brison (President of the Treasury Board, Lib.) moved:

That Vote 10, in the amount of $56,411,000, under Canadian Space Agency—Grants and contributions, in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2019, be concurred in.

The Deputy Speaker: The question is on Motion No. 18. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Deputy Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And five or more members having risen:

● (0050)

(The House divided on Motion No. 18, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 779)

YEAS

Members

Aldag	Alghabra
Amos	Anandasangaree
Ashton	Aubin
Bagnell	Bains
Beech	Bennett
Blaikie	Blair
Blaney (North Island—Powell River)	Boissonnault
Bossio	Boulerice
Boutin-Sweet	Bratina
Breton	Brison
Caesar-Chavannes	Caron
Casey (Cumberland—Colchester)	Casey (Charlottetown)
Champagne	Chen
Choquette	Cormier
Cuzner	Dabrusin
Damoff	DeCourcey
Dhaliwal	Dhillon
Drouin	Dubourg
Duclos	Duguid
Duncan (Edmonton Strathcona)	Duvall
Dzerowicz	Easter
Ehsassi	El Khoury
Ellis	Erskine-Smith
Eyking	Eyolfson
Fergus	Fillmore
Fisher	Fonseca
Fortier	Fragiskatos
Fraser (West Nova)	Fraser (Central Nova)
Fry	Fuhr
Garneau	Garrison
Gerretsen	Goldsmith-Jones
Goodale	Gould
Graham	Grewal
Hajdu	Harvey
Hébert	Hogg
Holland	Housefather
Hutchings	Joly
Jones	Khera
Kwan	Lambropoulos
Lametti	Lamoureux
Lebouthillier	Leslie
Lightbound	Lockhart
Long	Longfield
Ludwig	MacGregor
MacKinnon (Gatineau)	Malcolmson
Maloney	Masse (Windsor West)
Mathyssen	May (Cambridge)
McCrimmon	McGuinty
McKay	McKenna
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)	McLeod (Northwest Territories)
Mendès	Mendicino
Mihychuk	Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île-des-Sœurs)
Monsef	Murray
Ng	O'Connell
Oliphant	Oliver
Ouellette	Paradis
Peschisolido	Peterson
Petitpas Taylor	Philpott
Picard	Poissant
Quach	Qualtrough
Ramsey	Rioux
Robillard	Rodriguez
Rogers	Rudd
Rumny	Sahota
Saini	Sajjan
Samson	Sangha
Sarai	Scarpaleggia
Schulte	Serré
Shanahan	Sheehan
Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)	Sidhu (Brampton South)
Sikand	Sohi
Sorbara	Spengemann
Tabbara	Tan
Tassi	Trudeau
Trudel	Vandal
Vandenbeld	Vaughan
Whalen	Wilson-Raybould
Wrzesnewskyj	Yip
Young — 157	

NAYS

Members

Aboultaif	Albas
Albrecht	Allison
Anderson	Barlow
Barsalou-Duval	Benzen
Bergen	Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis)
Boudrias	Brassard
Chong	Clarke
Cooper	Diotte
Doherty	Dreeshen
Eglinski	Fast
Finley	Fortin
Gallant	Genuis
Godin	Harder
Jeneroux	Kelly
Kent	Kitchen
Kmiec	Lake
Leitch	Lobb
Lukiwski	Marcil
McCauley (Edmonton West)	McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)
Motz	Nater
Nuttall	O'Toole
Paul-Hus	Pauzé
Poilievre	Reid
Rempel	Richards
Saroya	Scheer
Schmale	Shipley
Sorenson	Ste-Marie
Stubbs	Thériault
Trost	Van Loan
Wagantall	Warkentin
Waugh	Webber
Wong	Yurdiga — 64

PAIRED

Members

Beaulieu	Gill
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)	
Plamondon	
Wilkinson	Zahid — 6

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 18 carried.

[*Translation*]

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 1—WINDSOR-DETROIT BRIDGE AUTHORITY

Hon. Scott Brison (President of the Treasury Board, Lib.) moved:

That Vote 1, in the amount of $195,992,153, under Windsor-Detroit Bridge Authority—Payments to the Windsor-Detroit Bridge Authority, in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2019, be concurred in.

The Deputy Speaker: The question is on Motion No. 19. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Deputy Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And five or more members having risen:

● (0055)

(The House divided on Motion No. 19, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 780)

YEAS

Members

Aldag	Alghabra
Amos	Anandasangaree
Ashton	Aubin
Bagnell	Bains
Beech	Bennett
Bibeau	Blaikie
Blair	Blaney (North Island—Powell River)
Boissonnault	Bossio
Boulerice	Boutin-Sweet
Bratina	Breton
Brison	Caesar-Chavannes
Caron	Casey (Cumberland—Colchester)
Casey (Charlottetown)	Champagne
Chen	Choquette
Cormier	Cuzner
Dabrusin	Damoff
DeCourcey	Dhaliwal
Dhillon	Drouin
Dubourg	Duclos
Duguid	Duncan (Edmonton Strathcona)
Duvall	Dzerowicz
Easter	Ehsassi
El Khoury	Ellis
Erskine-Smith	Eyking
Eyolfson	Fergus
Fillmore	Fisher
Fonseca	Fortier
Fragiskatos	Fraser (West Nova)
Fraser (Central Nova)	Fry
Fuhr	Garneau
Garrison	Gerretsen
Goldsmith-Jones	Goodale
Gould	Graham
Grewal	Hajdu
Harvey	Hébert
Hogg	Holland
Housefather	Hutchings
Joly	Jones
Khera	Kwan
Lambropoulos	Lametti
Lamoureux	Lebouthillier
Leslie	Lightbound
Lockhart	Long
Longfield	Ludwig
MacGregor	MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Malcolmson	Maloney
Masse (Windsor West)	Mathyssen
May (Cambridge)	McCrimmon
McGuinty	McKay
McKenna	McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
McLeod (Northwest Territories)	Mendès
Mendicino	Mihychuk
Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île des Soeurs)	
Monsef	
Murray	Ng
O'Connell	Oliphant
Oliver	Ouellette
Paradis	Peschisolido
Peterson	Petitpas Taylor
Philpott	Picard
Poissant	Quach
Qualtrough	Ramsey
Rioux	Robillard
Rodriguez	Rogers
Rudd	Rumy
Sahota	Saini
Sajjan	Samson
Sangha	Sarai
Scarpaleggia	Schulte
Serré	Shanahan
Sheehan	Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)
Sidhu (Brampton South)	Sikand
Sohi	Sorbara
Spengemann	Tabbara
Tan	Tassi
Vandal	Vandenbeld
Vaughan	Whalen
Wilson-Raybould	Wrzesnewskyj
Yip	Young — 156

NAYS

Members

Aboultaif	Albas
Albrecht	Allison
Anderson	Barlow
Barsalou-Duval	Benzen
Bergen	Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis)
Boudrias	Brassard
Chong	Clarke
Cooper	Diotte
Doherty	Dreeshen
Eglinski	Fast
Finley	Fortin
Gallant	Genuis
Godin	Harder
Jeneroux	Kelly
Kent	Kitchen
Kmiec	Lake
Lloyd	Lobb
Marcil	McCauley (Edmonton West)
McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)	Motz
Nater	Nuttall
O'Toole	Paul-Hus
Pauzé	Poilievre
Reid	Rempel
Richards	Saroya
Scheer	Schmale
Shipley	Sorenson
Ste-Marie	Stubbs
Thériault	Van Loan
Wagantall	Warkentin
Waugh	Webber
Wong	Yurdiga — 62

PAIRED

Members

Beaulieu	Gill
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)	
Plamondon	
Wilkinson	Zahid — 6

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 19 carried.

Business of Supply

● (0100)

[*English*]

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 1—LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT

Hon. Scott Brison (President of the Treasury Board, Lib.) moved:

That Vote 1, in the amount of $43,089,599, under Library of Parliament—Program expenditures, in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2019, be concurred in.

The Deputy Speaker: The question is on Motion No. 20. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Deputy Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And five or more members having risen:

● (0105)

[*Translation*]

(The House divided on Motion No. 20, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 781)

YEAS

Members

Aldag
Amos
Aubin
Bains
Bennett
Blaikie
Blaney (North Island—Powell River)
Bossio
Boutin-Sweet
Breton
Caesar-Chavannes
Casey (Cumberland—Colchester)
Champagne
Choquette
Cuzner
Damoff
Dhaliwal
Drouin
Duclos
Duvall
Easter
El-Khoury
Erskine-Smith
Eyolfson
Fillmore
Fonseca
Fragiskatos
Fraser (Central Nova)
Fuhr
Garrison
Goldsmith-Jones
Gould
Grewal
Harvey
Alghabra
Anandasangaree
Bagnell
Beech
Bibeau
Blair
Boissonnault
Boulerice
Bratina
Brison
Caron
Casey (Charlottetown)
Chen
Cormier
Dabrusin
DeCourcey
Dhillon
Dubourg
Duguid
Dzerowicz
Ehsassi
Ellis
Eyking
Fergus
Fisher
Fortier
Fraser (West Nova)
Fry
Gameau
Gerretsen
Goodale
Graham
Hajdu
Hébert
Hogg
Housefather
Johns
Jones
Kwan
Lametti
Lebouthillier
Lightbound
Long
Ludwig
MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Maloney
Mathyssen
McCrimmon
McKay
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
Mendès
Mihychuk
Socurs)
Monsef
Ng
Oliphant
Ouellette
Peschisolido
Petitpas Taylor
Picard
Qualtrough
Rioux
Rodriguez
Rudd
Sahota
Sajjan
Sangha
Scarpaleggia
Serré
Sheehan
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Simms
Sorbara
Tabbara
Tassi
Vandal
Vaughan
Wilson-Raybould
Yip
Holland
Hutchings
Joly
Khera
Lambropoulos
Lamoureux
Leslie
Lockhart
Longfield
MacGregor
Malcolmson
Masse (Windsor West)
May (Cambridge)
McGuinty
McKenna
McLeod (Northwest Territories)
Mendicino
Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île des
Murray
O'Connell
Oliver
Paradis
Peterson
Philpott
Poissant
Ramsey
Robillard
Rogers
Ruimy
Saini
Samson
Sarai
Schulte
Shanahan
Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)
Sikand
Sohi
Spengemann
Tan
Trudel
Vandenbeld
Whalen
Wrzesnewsky)
Young 156

NAYS

Members

Aboultaif
Albrecht
Anderson
Barsalou-Duval
Bergen
Boudrias
Chong
Cooper
Doherty
Eglinski
Finley
Gallant
Godin
Jeneroux
Kent
Kmiec
Lloyd
Lukiwski
McCauley (Edmonton West)
Motz
O'Toole
Poilievre
Richards
Scheer
Shipley
Ste-Marie
Stubbs
Van Loan
Warkentin
Yurdiga 59
Albas
Allison
Barlow
Benzen
Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis)
Brassard
Clarke
Diotte
Dreeshen
Fast
Fortin
Genuis
Harder
Kelly
Kitchen
Lake
Lobb
Marcil
McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)
Nater
Paul-Hus
Reid
Saroya
Schmale
Sorenson
Strahl
Thériault
Wagantall
Webber

PAIRED

Members

Beaulieu — Gill
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)
Plamondon
Wilkinson — Zahid — 6

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 20 carried.

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 1—LIBRARY AND ARCHIVES OF CANADA

Hon. Scott Brison (President of the Treasury Board, Lib.) moved:

That Vote 1, in the amount of $100,003,482, under Library and Archives of Canada—Operating expenditures and contributions, in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2019, be concurred in.

The Deputy Speaker: The next question is on Motion No. 21. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Deputy Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And five or more members having risen:

● (0110)

(The House divided on Motion No. 21, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 782)

YEAS

Members

Aldag
Anandasangaree
Bagnell
Beech
Bibeau
Blair
Boissonnault
Boulerice
Bratina
Brison
Caron
Casey (Charlottetown)
Chen
Cormier
Dabrusin
DeCourcey
Dhillon
Dubourg
Duguid
Easter
El-Khoury
Erskine-Smith
Eyolfson
Fillmore
Fonseca
Fragiskatos
Fraser (Central Nova)
Fuhr
Gerretsen
Goodale
Amos
Aubin
Bains
Bennett
Blaikie
Blaney (North Island—Powell River)
Bossio
Boutin-Sweet
Breton
Caesar-Chavannes
Casey (Cumberland—Colchester)
Champagne
Choquette
Cuzner
Damoff
Dhaliwal
Drouin
Duclos
Duvall
Ehsassi
Ellis
Eyking
Fergus
Fisher
Fortier
Fraser (West Nova)
Fry
Garneau
Goldsmith-Jones
Gould
Graham
Hajdu
Hébert
Holland
Hutchings
Joly
Khera
Lambropoulos
Lamoureux
Leslie
Lockhart
Longfield
MacGregor
Malcolmson
Masse (Windsor West)
McCrimmon
McKay
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
Mendès
Mihychuk
Monsef
Ng
Oliphant
Ouellette
Peschisolido
Petitpas Taylor
Picard
Qualtrough
Rioux
Rodriguez
Rudd
Sabota
Sajjan
Sangha
Scarpaleggia
Serré
Sheehan
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Simms
Sorbara
Tabbara
Tassi
Vandal
Vaughan
Wilson-Raybould
Yip
Grewal
Harvey
Hogg
Housefather
Johns
Jones
Kwan
Lametti
Lebouthillier
Lightbound
Long
Ludwig
MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Maloney
May (Cambridge)
McGuinty
McKenna
McLeod (Northwest Territories)
Mendicino
Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île-des-Sœurs)
Murray
O'Connell
Oliver
Paradis
Peterson
Philpott
Poissant
Ramsey
Robillard
Rogers
Rumny
Saini
Samson
Sarai
Schulte
Shanahan
Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)
Sikand
Sohi
Spengemann
Tan
Trudel
Vandenbeld
Whalen
Wrzesnewskyj
Young — 152

NAYS

Members

Aboultaif
Albrecht
Anderson
Barsalou-Duval
Bergen
Boudrias
Clarke
Diotte
Eglinski
Finley
Gallant
Godin
Jeneroux
Kent
Kmiec
Lloyd
Marcil
McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)
Nater
Paul-Hus
Reid
Saroya
Shipley
Ste-Marie
Stubbs
Van Loan
Warkentin
Webber
Albas
Allison
Barlow
Benzen
Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis)
Brassard
Cooper
Dreeshen
Fast
Fortin
Genuis
Harder
Kelly
Kitchen
Lake
Lukiwski
McCauley (Edmonton West)
Motz
O'Toole
Poilievre
Richards
Schmale
Sorenson
Strahl
Thériault
Wagantall
Waugh
Yurdiga — 56

PAIRED

Members

Beaulieu — Gill
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)—Plamondon
Wilkinson — Zahid — 6

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 21 carried.

[*English*]

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 5—LIBRARY AND ARCHIVES OF CANADA

Hon. Scott Brison (President of the Treasury Board, Lib.) moved:

That Vote 5, in the amount of $8,818,036, under Library and Archives of Canada—Capital expenditures, in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2019, be concurred in.

The Deputy Speaker: The question is on Motion No. 22. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Deputy Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And five or more members having risen:

● (0120)

(The House divided on Motion No. 22, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 783)

YEAS

Members

Aldag
Anandasangaree
Bagnell
Beech
Bibeau
Blair
Boissonnault
Boulerice
Bratina
Brison
Caron
Casey (Charlottetown)
Chen
Cormier
Dabrusin
DeCourcey
Dhillon
Dubourg
Duguid
Easter
El Khoury
Erskine-Smith
Eyolfson
Fillmore
Fonseca
Fragiskatos
Fraser (Central Nova)
Fuhr
Gerretsen
Goodale
Graham
Hajdu
Hébert
Holland
Hutchings
Joly
Khera
Lambropoulos
Lamoureux
Leslie
Lockhart
Longfield
MacGregor
Malcolmson
Masse (Windsor West)
May (Cambridge)
McGuinty
McKenna
McLeod (Northwest Territories)
Mendicino
Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île des Sœurs)
Monsef
Murray
O'Connell
Oliver
Paradis
Peterson
Philpott
Poissant
Ramsey
Robillard
Rogers
Rumiy
Saini
Samson
Sarai
Schulte
Shanahan
Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)
Sikand
Sohi
Spengemann
Tan
Trudel
Vandenbeld
Whalen
Wrzesnewskyj
Young — 153

Amos
Aubin
Bains
Bennett
Blaikie
Blaney (North Island—Powell River)
Bossio
Boutin-Sweet
Breton
Caesar-Chavannes
Casey (Cumberland—Colchester)
Champagne
Choquette
Cuzner
Damoff
Dhaliwal
Drouin
Duclos
Dzerowicz
Ehsassi
Ellis
Eyking
Fergus
Fisher
Fortier
Fraser (West Nova)
Fry
Garneau
Goldsmith-Jones
Gould
Grewal
Harvey
Hogg
Housefather
Johns
Jones
Kwan
Lametti
Lebouthillier
Lightbound
Long
Ludwig
MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Maloney
Mathyssen
McCrimmon
McKay
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
Mendès
Mihychuk
Ng
Oliphant
Ouellette
Peschisolido
Petitpas Taylor
Picard
Qualtrough
Rioux
Rodriguez
Rudd
Sahota
Sajjan
Sangha
Scarpaleggia
Serré
Sheehan
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Simms
Sorbara
Tabbara
Tassi
Vandal
Vaughan
Wilson-Raybould
Yip

NAYS

Members

Aboultaif
Albrecht
Anderson
Barsalou-Duval
Bergen
Brassard
Cooper
Dreeshen
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Fortin
Godin
Jeneroux
Kent
Lake
Marcil
Motz
O'Toole
Rempel
Saroya
Shipley
Ste-Marie
Stubbs
Van Loan
Warkentin
Webber
Albas
Allison
Barlow
Benzen
Boudrias
Clarke
Diotte
Eglinski
Fast
Genuis
Harder
Kelly
Kitchen
Lukiwski
McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)
Nater
Reid
Richards
Schmale
Sorenson
Strahl
Thériault
Wagantall
Waugh
Yurdiga — 50

PAIRED

Members

Beaulieu — Gill
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)
Plamondon
Wilkinson — Zahid — 6

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 22 carried.

[*Translation*]

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 1—CANADIAN TRANSPORTATION ACCIDENT INVESTIGATION AND SAFETY BOARD

Hon. Scott Brison (President of the Treasury Board, Lib.) moved:

That Vote 1, in the amount of $26,961,605, under Canadian Transportation Accident Investigation and Safety Board—Program expenditures, in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2019, be concurred in.

The Deputy Speaker: The question is on Motion No. 23. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Deputy Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And five or more members having risen:

● (0125)

[*English*]

(The House divided on Motion No. 23, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 784)

YEAS

Members

Aldag
Amos
Bagnell
Beech
Bibeau
Blair
Boissonnault
Boulerice
Bratina
Brison
Caron
Casey (Charlottetown)
Chen
Cormier
Dabrusin
DeCourcey
Dhillon
Dubourg
Duguid
Easter
El Khoury
Erskine-Smith
Eyolfson
Fillmore
Fonseca
Fortin
Fraser (West Nova)
Fry
Garneau
Goldsmith-Jones
Gould
Grewal
Harvey
Hogg
Housefather
Johns
Jones
Kwan
Lametti
Lebouthillier
Lightbound
Long
Ludwig
MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Maloney
Mathyssen
McCrimmon
McKay
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
Mendès
Mihychuk
Soeurs)
Monsef
Ng
Oliphant
Ouellette
Peschisolido
Philpott
Poissant
Ramsey
Robillard
Rogers
Rumy
Saini
Samson
Sarai
Schulte
Shanahan
Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)
Sikand
Sohi
Spengemann
Tabbara
Tassi
Tradel
Vandenbeld
Whalen
Wrzesnewskyj
Young — 155

Alghabra
Anandasangaree
Bains
Bennett
Blaikie
Blaney (North Island—Powell River)
Bossio
Boutin-Sweet
Breton
Caesar-Chavannes
Casey (Cumberland—Colchester)
Champagne
Choquette
Cuzner
Damoff
Dhaliwal
Drouin
Duclos
Dzerowicz
Ehsassi
Ellis
Eyking
Fergus
Fisher
Fortier
Fragiskatos
Fraser (Central Nova)
Fuhr
Gerretsen
Goodale
Graham
Hajdu
Hébert
Holland
Hutchings
Joly
Khera
Lambropoulos
Lamoureux
Leslie
Lockhart
Longfield
MacGregor
Malcolmson
Masse (Windsor West)
May (Cambridge)
McGuinty
McKenna
McLeod (Northwest Territories)
Mendicino
Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île-des-
Murray
O'Connell
Oliver
Paradis
Petitpas Taylor
Picard
Qualtrough
Rioux
Rodriguez
Rudd
Sahota
Sajjan
Sangha
Scarpaleggia
Serré
Sheehan
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Simms
Sorbara
Ste-Marie
Tan
Thériault
Vandal
Vaughan
Wilson-Raybould
Yip

NAYS

Members

Aboultaif
Albrecht
Anderson
Barsalou-Duval
Bergen
Brassard
Cooper
Dreeshen
Fast
Genuis
Harder
Jeneroux
Kent
Kmiec
Lukiwski
McCauley (Edmonton West)
Motz
O'Toole
Rempel
Saroya
Shields
Sorenson
Stubbs
Viersen
Waugh
Albas
Allison
Barlow
Benzen
Boudrias
Clarke
Diotte
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Gallant
Godin
Hoback
Kelly
Kitchen
Lake
Marcil
McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)
Nater
Reid
Richards
Schmale
Shipley
Strahl
Van Loan
Warkentin
Webber

Yurdiga — Zimmer — 52

PAIRED

Members

Beaulieu — Gill
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)
Plamondon
Wilkinson — Zahid — 6

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No.23 carried.

● (0130)

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 1—OFFICE OF THE CORRECTIONAL INVESTIGATOR OF CANADA

Hon. Scott Brison (President of the Treasury Board, Lib.) moved:

That Vote 1, in the amount of $4,129,824, under Office of the Correctional Investigator of Canada—Program expenditures, in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2019, be concurred in.

The Deputy Speaker: The question is on Motion No. 24. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Deputy Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And five or more members having risen:

(The House divided on Motion No. 24, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 785)

YEAS

Members

Aldag
Alleslev
Anandasangaree
Bagnell
Beech
Bibeau
Blair
Bossio
Boutin-Sweet
Breton
Brosseau
Caron
Casey (Charlottetown)
Chen
Cormier
Dabrusin
DeCourcey
Dhillon
Dubourg
Duguid
Dzerowicz
Ehsassi
Ellis
Eyking
Fergus
Fisher
Fortier
Fraser (West Nova)
Fry
Garneau
Goldsmith-Jones
Gould
Grewal
Harvey
Hogg
Housefather
Johns
Jones
Lambropoulos
Lamoureux
Lightbound
Long
Ludwig
MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Maloney
Mathyssen
McCrimmon
McKay
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
Mendès
Mihychuk
Socurs)
Monsef
Ng
Oliphant
Ouellette
Peschisolido
Petitpas Taylor
Picard
Qualtrough
Rioux
Rogers
Sahota
Sajjan
Sangha
Scarpaleggia
Serré
Sheehan
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Simms
Sorbara
Tabbara
Tassi
Vandal
Vaughan
Wilson-Raybould
Yip
Alghabra
Amos
Badawey
Bains
Bennett
Blaikie
Boissonnault
Boulerice
Bratina
Brison
Caesar-Chavannes
Casey (Cumberland—Colchester)
Champagne
Choquette
Cuzner
Damoff
Dhaliwal
Drouin
Duclos
Duvall
Easter
El-Khoury
Erskine-Smith
Eyolfson
Fillmore
Fonseca
Fragiskatos
Fraser (Central Nova)
Fuhr
Gerretsen
Goodale
Graham
Hajdu
Hebert
Holland
Hutchings
Joly
Khera
Lametti
Lebouthillier
Lockhart
Longfield
MacGregor
Malcolmson
Masse (Windsor West)
May (Cambridge)
McGuinty
McKenna
McLeod (Northwest Territories)
Mendicino
Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île-des-
Murray
O'Connell
Oliver
Paradis
Peterson
Philpott
Poissant
Ramsey
Robillard
Rudd
Saini
Samson
Sarai
Schulte
Shanahan
Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)
Sikand
Sohi
Spengemann
Tan
Trudel
Vandenbeld
Whalen
Wrzesnewskyj
Young — 152

NAYS

Members

Aboultaif
Albrecht
Anderson
Barsalou-Duval
Boudrias
Cooper
Dreeshen
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Gallant
Harder
Jeneroux
Kent
Kmiec
Lobb
Marcil
McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)
O'Toole
Richards
Schmale
Shipley
Ste-Marie
Stubbs
Van Loan
Warkentin
Webber
Zimmer — 51
Albas
Allison
Barlow
Benzen
Brassard
Diotte
Eglinski
Fortin
Gennis
Hoback
Kelly
Kitchen
Lake
Lukiwski
McCauley (Edmonton West)
Nater
Rempel
Saroya
Shields
Sorenson
Strahl
Thériault
Viersen
Waugh
Yurdiga

PAIRED

Members

Beaulieu — Gill
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia) — Plamondon
Wilkinson — Zahid — 6

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 24 carried.

● (0135)

[*Translation*]

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 1—OFFICE OF INFRASTRUCTURE OF CANADA

Hon. Scott Brison (President of the Treasury Board, Lib.) moved: That Vote 1, in the amount of $99,901,528, under Office of Infrastructure of Canada—Operating expenditures, in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2019, be concurred in.

The Speaker: The question is on Motion No. 25. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And five or more members having risen:

● (0140)

(The House divided on Motion No. 25, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 786)

YEAS

Members

Aldag — Alleslev
Amos — Anandasangaree
Arseneault — Arya
Ayoub — Badawey
Bagnell — Bains
Beech — Bennett
Bibeau — Blaikie
Boulerice — Boutin-Sweet
Brison — Brosseau
Caesar-Chavannes — Caron
Casey (Cumberland—Colchester) — Choquette
Cormier — Cuzner
Damoff — Dhaliwal
Dhillon — Drouin
Dubourg — Duclos
Duguid — Duvall
Dzerowicz — Easter
El-Khoury — Ellis
Erskine-Smith — Eyking
Eyolfson — Fergus
Fisher — Fonseca
Fortier — Fragiskatos
Fraser (West Nova) — Fraser (Central Nova)
Fry — Fuhr
Garneau — Gerretsen
Graham — Grewal
Hajdu — Harvey
Hébert — Hehr
Hogg — Housefather
Hutchings — Iacono
Johns — Jones
Khera — Lambropoulos
Lametti — Lamoureux
Lapointe — Luzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation)
Lebouthillier — Levitt
Lightbound — Lockhart
MacGregor — MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Masse (Windsor West) — Mathyssen
McCrimmon — McGuinty
McKay — McKenna
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam) — McLeod (Northwest Territories)
Mendès — Mendicino
Mihychuk — Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île des Sœurs)
Monsef — Murray
Nault — Ng
O'Connell — Oliphant
O'Regan — Ouellette
Paradis — Peschisolido
Peterson — Philpott
Picard — Poissant
Qualtrough — Ramsey
Robillard — Rogers
Romanado — Rudd
Sahota — Saini
Samson — Sangha
Sarai — Scarpaleggia
Schiefke — Schulte
Serré — Shanahan
Sheehan — Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)
Sidhu (Brampton South) — Sikand
Simms — Sohi
Sorbara — Spengemann
Tabbara — Tan
Tassi — Trudel
Vandal — Vandenbeld
Vaughan — Whalen
Wilson-Raybould — Yip
Young — 135

NAYS

Members

Aboultaif — Albas
Albrecht — Allison
Anderson — Barlow
Barsalou-Duval — Benzen
Brassard — Chong
Cooper — Diotte
Dreeshen — Eglinski
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster) — Fast
Fortin — Gallant
Gennis — Harder
Hoback — Jeneroux
Kelly — Kent
Kitchen — Kmiec
Lake — Lobb
Lukiwski — Marcil
McCauley (Edmonton West) — Motz
Nater — Nuttall
O'Toole — Rempel
Richards — Saroya
Schmale — Shipley
Sorenson — Ste-Marie
Strahl — Stubbs
Thériault — Van Loan
Viersen — Wagantall
Warkentin — Waugh
Webber — Yurdiga
Zimmer — 53

PAIRED

Members

Beaulieu — Gill
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia) — Plamondon
Wilkinson — Zahid — 6

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 25 carried.

[*English*]

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 5—OFFICE OF INFRASTRUCTURE OF CANADA

Hon. Scott Brison (President of the Treasury Board, Lib.) moved:

That Vote 5, in the amount of $760,949,312, under Office of Infrastructure of Canada—Capital expenditures, in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2019, be concurred in.

● (0145)

The Deputy Speaker: The question is on Motion No. 26. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Deputy Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And five or more members having risen:

(The House divided on Motion No. 26, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 787)

YEAS

Members

Aldag
Amos
Arseneault
Ayoub
Bagnell
Baylis
Bennett
Blaikie
Boutin-Sweet
Brosseau
Casey (Cumberland—Colchester)
Cormier
Damoff
Drouin
Duclos
Duvall
Easter
El-Khoury
Erskine-Smith
Eyolfson
Fisher
Fortier
Fraser (West Nova)
Fry
Garneau
Graham
Hajdu
Hébert
Hogg
Hutchings
Jones
Lambropoulos
Lamoureux
Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation)
Levitt
Lockhart
Alleslev
Anandasangaree
Arya
Badawey
Bains
Beech
Bibeau
Boulerice
Brison
Caesar-Chavannes
Choquette
Cuzner
Dhaliwal
Dubourg
Duguid
Dzerowicz
Ehsassi
Ellis
Eyking
Fergus
Fonseca
Fragiskatos
Fraser (Central Nova)
Fuhr
Gerretsen
Grewal
Harvey
Hehr
Housefather
Iacono
Khera
Lametti
Lapointe
Lebouthillier
Lightbound
MacGregor
MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Mathyssen
McGuinty
McKenna
McLeod (Northwest Territories)
Mendicino
Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île-des-Sœurs)
Monsef
Murray
Ng
Oliphant
O'Regan
Paradis
Peterson
Picard
Qualtrough
Robillard
Romanado
Ruimy
Saini
Sangha
Scarpaleggia
Schulte
Shanahan
Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)
Sikand
Sohi
Spengemann
Tan
Trudel
Vandenbeld
Wilson-Raybould
Yip
Masse (Windsor West)
McCrimmon
McKay
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
Mendès
Mihychuk
Nault
O'Connell
Oliver
Ouellette
Peschisolido
Philpott
Poissant
Ramsey
Rogers
Rudd
Sabota
Samson
Sarai
Schiefke
Serré
Sheehan
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Simms
Sorbara
Tabbara
Tassi
Vandal
Vaughan
Wrzesnewskyj
Young — 136

NAYS

Members

Albas
Allison
Barlow
Benzen
Cooper
Dreeshen
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Fortin
Gennis
Hoback
Kelly
Kmiec
Lobb
Marcil
Motz
Nuttall
Rempel
Saroya
Shipley
Ste-Marie
Stubbs
Van Loan
Wagantall
Webber
Zimmer — 49
Albrecht
Anderson
Barsalou-Duval
Chong
Diotte
Eglinski
Fast
Gallant
Harder
Jeneroux
Kitchen
Lake
Lukiwski
McCauley (Edmonton West)
Nater
O'Toole
Richards
Schmale
Sorenson
Strahl
Thériault
Viersen
Waugh
Yurdiga

PAIRED

Members

Beaulieu
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)
Plamondon
Wilkinson
Gill
Zahid — 6

The Deputy Speaker: I declared Motion No. 26 carried.

Mr. Tom Kmiec: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. A very good morning to you, Sir. I believe if you look at the record, the member for St. John's East voted without a jacket on. I believe the rules of the House state his vote cannot be recorded.

The Deputy Speaker: It seems to have been a rather persuasive point of order.

[*Translation*]

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 10—OFFICE OF INFRASTRUCTURE OF CANADA

Hon. Scott Brison (President of the Treasury Board, Lib.) moved:

That Vote 10, in the amount of $3,111,503,619, under Office of Infrastructure of Canada—Grants and contributions, in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2019, be concurred in.

The Deputy Speaker: The question is on Motion No. 27. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Deputy Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And five or more members having risen:

● (0150)

(The House divided on Motion No. 27, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 788)

YEAS

Members

Aldag	Allesley
Amos	Anandasangaree
Arseneault	Arya
Ayoub	Badawey
Bagnell	Bains
Baylis	Beech
Bennett	Bibeau
Blaikie	Blaney (North Island—Powell River)
Boulerice	Boutin-Sweet
Brison	Brosseau
Caesar-Chavannes	Casey (Cumberland—Colchester)
Cormier	Cuzner
Damoff	Dhaliwal
Dhillon	Drouin
Dubourg	Duclos
Duguid	Duvall
Dzerowicz	Easter
Ehsassi	El Khoury
Ellis	Erskine-Smith
Eyking	Eyolfson
Fergus	Fisher
Fonseca	Fortier
Fragiskatos	Fraser (West Nova)
Fraser (Central Nova)	Fry
Fuhr	Garneau
Gerretsen	Graham
Grewal	Hajdu
Hébert	Hehr
Hogg	Housefather
Hutchings	Iacono
Johns	Jones
Khera	Kwan
Lambropoulos	Lametti
Lamoureux	Lapointe
Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite Nation)	Lebouthillier
Levitt	Lightbound
Lockhart	MacGregor
MacKinnon (Gatineau)	Malcolmson
Masse (Windsor West)	Mathyssen
McCrimmon	McGuinty
McKay	McKenna
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)	McLeod (Northwest Territories)
Mendès	Mendicino
Mihychuk	Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île-des-Sœurs)
Murray	Nault
Ng	O'Connell
Oliphant	Oliver
O'Regan	Ouellette
Paradis	Peschisolido
Peterson	Philpott
Picard	Poissant
Qualtrough	Robillard
Rodriguez	Rogers
Romanado	Rudd
Ruimy	Sahota
Saini	Samson
Sangha	Sarai
Scarpaleggia	Schiefke
Schulte	Serré
Shanahan	Sheehan
Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)	Sidhu (Brampton South)
Sikand	Simms
Sohi	Sorbara
Spengemann	Tabbara
Tan	Tassi
Vandal	Vandenbeld
Vaughan	Whalen
Wilson-Raybould	Wrzesnewskyj
Yip	Young—138

NAYS

Members

Albas	Albrecht
Allison	Anderson
Barlow	Barsalou-Duval
Benzen	Brassard
Chong	Cooper
Diotte	Dreeshen
Eglinski	Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Fast	Fortin
Gallant	Genuis
Harder	Hoback
Jeneroux	Kelly
Kitchen	Kmiec
Lake	Lobb
Lukiwski	Marcil
McCauley (Edmonton West)	Motz
Nater	Nuttall
O'Toole	Paul-Hus
Rempel	Richards
Saroya	Schmale
Shipley	Sorenson
Ste-Marie	Strahl
Stubbs	Van Loan
Viersen	Wagantall
Waugh	Webber
Yurdiga	Zimmer—50

PAIRED

Members

Beaulieu	Gill
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)	Plamondon
Wilkinson	Zahid—6

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 27 carried.

● (0155)

[*English*]

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 1—OFFICE OF THE CO-ORDINATOR, STATUS OF WOMEN

Hon. Scott Brison (President of the Treasury Board, Lib.) moved:

That Vote 1, in the amount of $36,872,996, under Office of the Co-ordinator, Status of Women—Operating expenditures, in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2019, be concurred in.

The Deputy Speaker: The next question is on Motion No. 28. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Deputy Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And five or more members having risen:

● (0200)

[*Translation*]

(The House divided on Motion No. 28, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 789)

YEAS

Members

Aldag	Alleslev
Amos	Anandasangaree
Arseneault	Arya
Ayoub	Badawey
Bagnell	Bains
Baylis	Beech
Bennett	Bibeau
Blaikie	Blaney (North Island—Powell River)
Boulerice	Boutin-Sweet
Brison	Caesar-Chavannes
Casey (Cumberland—Colchester)	Cormier
Cuzner	Damoff
Dhaliwal	Dhillon
Dubourg	Duclos
Duguid	Duvall
Dzerowicz	Easter
Ehsassi	El-Khoury
Ellis	Erskine-Smith
Eyking	Eyolfson
Fergus	Fisher
Fonseca	Fragiskatos
Fraser (West Nova)	Fraser (Central Nova)
Fry	Fuhr
Garneau	Gerretsen
Graham	Grewal
Hajdu	Harvey
Hébert	Hehr
Hogg	Housefather
Hutchings	Iacono
Johns	Jones
Khera	Kwan
Lambropoulos	Lametti
Lamoureux	Lapointe
Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite Nation)	Lebouthillier
Levitt	Lightbound
Lockhart	MacGregor
MacKinnon (Gatineau)	Malcolmson
Masse (Windsor West)	McCrimmon
McGuinty	McKay
McKenna	McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
McLeod (Northwest Territories)	Mendès
Mendicino	Mihychuk
Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île-des-Sœurs)	Ng
Murray	Oliphant
Nault	O'Regan
O'Connell	Paradis
Oliver	Peterson
Ouellette	Poissant
Peschisolido	Robillard
Philpott	Rogers
Qualtrough	Rudd
Rodriguez	Sahota
Romanado	Samson
Rumy	Sarai
Saini	Schiefke
Sangha	Serré
Scarpaleggia	Sheehan
Schulte	Sidhu (Brampton South)
Shanahan	Simms
Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)	Sorbara
Sikand	Tabbara
Sohi	Tassi
Spengemann	Vandenbeld
Tan	Whalen
Vandal	Wrzesnewskyj
Vaughan	Young—134
Wilson-Raybould	
Yip	

NAYS

Members

Albas	Albrecht
Allison	Anderson
Barlow	Barsalou-Duval
Benzen	Brassard
Chong	Cooper
Diotte	Dreeshen
Eglinski	Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Fast	Fortin
Gallant	Gennis
Harder	Hoback
Jeneroux	Kelly
Kitchen	Kmiec
Lake	Lobb
Lukiwski	Marcil
McCauley (Edmonton West)	Motz
Nater	Nuttall
O'Toole	Paul-Hus
Rempel	Richards
Saroya	Schmale
Sorenson	Ste-Marie
Strahl	Stubbs
Thériault	Van Loan
Wagantall	Warkentin
Waugh	Webber
Yurdiga	Zimmer—50

PAIRED

Members

Beaulieu	Gill
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)	
Plamondon	
Wilkinson	Zahid—6

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 28 carried.

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 5—OFFICE OF THE CO-ORDINATOR, STATUS OF WOMEN

Hon. Scott Brison (President of the Treasury Board, Lib.) moved: That Vote 5, in the amount of $22,680,000, under Office of the Co-ordinator, Status of Women—Grants and contributions, in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2019, be concurred in.

The Deputy Speaker: The question is on Motion No. 29. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Deputy Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And five or more members having risen:

● (0205)

(The House divided on Motion No. 29, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 790)

YEAS

Members

Aldag	Alleslev
Amos	Anandasangaree
Arseneault	Arya
Ayoub	Badawey
Bagnell	Bains
Baylis	Beech
Bennett	Bibeau
Blaikie	Blaney (North Island—Powell River)
Boulerice	Boutin-Sweet
Brison	Caesar-Chavannes
Casey (Cumberland—Colchester)	Cormier
Cuzner	Damoff
Dhaliwal	Dhillon
Dubourg	Duclos
Duguid	Duvall
Dzerowicz	Easter
Ehsassi	El-Khoury
Ellis	Eyking
Eyolfson	Fergus
Fisher	Fonseca
Fortier	Fragiskatos
Fraser (West Nova)	Fraser (Central Nova)
Fry	Fuhr
Garneau	Gerretsen
Graham	Grewal
Hajdu	Harvey
Hébert	Hehr
Hogg	Housefather
Hutchings	Iacono
Johns	Jones
Khera	Kwan
Lambropoulos	Lametti
Lamoureux	Lapointe
Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite Nation)	Leboutillier
Levitt	Lightbound
Lockhart	MacGregor
MacKinnon (Gatineau)	Malcolmson
Masse (Windsor West)	McCrimmon
McGuinty	McKay
McKenna	McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
McLeod (Northwest Territories)	Mendès
Mendicino	Mihychuk
Miller (Ville Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île des Soeurs)	
Murray	
Nault	Ng
O'Connell	Oliphant
Oliver	O'Regan
Ouellette	Paradis
Peschisolido	Peterson
Philpott	Picard
Poissant	Qualtrough
Robillard	Rodriguez
Rogers	Romanado
Rudd	Ruimy
Sahota	Saini
Samson	Sangha
Sarai	Scarpaleggia
Schiefke	Schulte
Serré	Shanahan
Sheehan	Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)
Sidhu (Brampton South)	Sikand
Simms	Sohi
Sorbara	Spengemann
Tabbara	Tan
Tassi	Vandal
Vandenbeld	Vaughan
Whalen	Wrzesnewskyj
Yip	Young — 134

NAYS

Members

Albas	Albrecht
Allison	Anderson
Barlow	Barsalou-Duval
Benzen	Brassard
Chong	Cooper
Diotte	Dreeshen
Eglinski	Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Fast	Fortin
Genuis	Harder
Hoback	Jeneroux
Kelly	Kent
Kitchen	Kmiec
Lake	Lobb
McCauley (Edmonton West)	Motz
Nater	Nuttall
O'Toole	Paul-Hus
Poilievre	Rempel
Richards	Saroya
Scheer	Schmale
Sorenson	Ste-Marie
Strahl	Stubbs
Thériault	Van Loan
Wagantall	Warkentin
Waugh	Webber
Yurdiga	Zimmer — 50

PAIRED

Members

Beaulieu	Gill
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)	
Plamondon	
Wilkinson	Zahid — 6

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 29 carried.

[*English*]

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 1—OFFICE OF THE COMMISSIONER FOR FEDERAL JUDICIAL AFFAIRS

Hon. Scott Brison (President of the Treasury Board, Lib.) moved:

That Vote 1, in the amount of $8,064,447, under Office of the Commissioner for Federal Judicial Affairs—Operating expenditures, in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2019, be concurred in.

The Deputy Speaker: The question is on Motion No. 30. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Deputy Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And five or more members having risen:

● (0210)

(The House divided on Motion No. 30, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 791)

YEAS

Members

Aldag	Alleslev
Amos	Anandasangaree
Arseneault	Arya
Ayoub	Badawey
Bagnell	Bains
Baylis	Beech
Bennett	Bibeau
Blaikie	Blaney (North Island—Powell River)
Bonderice	Brison
Caesar-Chavannes	Casey (Cumberland—Colchester)
Cormier	Cuzner
Dabrusin	Dhaliwal
Dhillon	Drouin
Dubourg	Duclos
Dugrid	Duvall
Dzerowicz	Easter
Ehsassi	El-Khoury
Ellis	Eyking
Eyolfson	Fergus
Fisher	Fonseca
Fortier	Fragiskatos
Fraser (West Nova)	Fraser (Central Nova)
Fry	Fuhr
Garneau	Gerretsen
Graham	Hajdu
Harvey	Hébert
Hehr	Hogg
Housefather	Hutchings
Iacono	Johns
Jones	Khera
Kwan	Lambropoulos
Lametti	Lamoureux
Lapointe	Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation)
Lebouthillier	Levitt
Lightbound	Lockhart
MacGregor	MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Malcolmson	Massé (Windsor West)
Mathyssen	McCrimmon
McGuinty	McKay
McKenna	McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
McLeod (Northwest Territories)	Mendès
Mendicino	Mihychuk
Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île-des-Sœurs)	
Murray	
Nault	Ng
O'Connell	Oliphant
Oliver	O'Regan
Ouellette	Paradis
Peschisolido	Peterson
Philpott	Picard
Poissant	Qualtrough
Robillard	Rodriguez
Rogers	Romanado
Rudd	Rumy
Sahota	Saini
Samson	Sangha
Sarai	Scarpaleggia
Schiefke	Schulte
Serré	Shanahan
Sheehan	Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)
Sidhu (Brampton South)	Sikand
Simms	Sohi
Sorbara	Spengemann
Tabbara	Tan
Tassi	Vandal
Vandenbeld	Vaughan
Whalen	Wilson-Raybould
Wrzesnewskyj	Yip
Young—135	

NAYS

Members

Albas	Albrecht
Allison	Anderson
Barlow	Barsalou-Duval
Benzen	Brassard
Chong	Cooper
Diotte	Dreeshen
Eglinski	Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Fast	Fortin
Genuis	Harder
Hoback	Jeneroux
Kelly	Kent
Kitchen	Kmiec
Lake	Lobb
McCauley (Edmonton West)	Motz
Nater	O'Toole
Paul-Hus	Poilievre
Reid	Rempel
Richards	Savoya
Scheer	Schmale
Soroenson	Ste-Marie
Strahl	Stubbs
Thériault	Van Loan
Wagantall	Warkentin
Waugh	Webber
Yurdiga—50	

PAIRED

Members

Beaulieu	Gill
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)	
Plamondon	
Wilkinson	Zahid—6

The Deputy Speaker:

I declare Motion No. 30 carried.

[Translation]

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 5—OFFICE OF THE COMMISSIONER FOR FEDERAL JUDICIAL AFFAIRS

Hon. Scott Brison (President of the Treasury Board, Lib.) moved:

That Vote 5, in the amount of $2,039,412, under Office of the Commissioner for Federal Judicial Affairs—Operating expenditures, in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2019, be concurred in.

● (0215)

The Deputy Speaker: The question is on Motion No. 31. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Deputy Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And five or more members having risen:

(The House divided on Motion No. 31, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 792)

YEAS

Members

Aldag
Amos
Arseneault
Ayoub
Bagnell
Baylis
Bennett
Blaney (North Island Powell River)
Brison
Casey (Cumberland Colchester)
Cormier
Damoff
Dhillon
Dubourg
Duguid
Dzerowicz
Ehsassi
Ellis
Eyolfson
Fillmore
Fonseca
Fragiskatos
Fraser (Central Nova)
Fuhr
Gerretsen
Grewal
Harvey
Hehr
Housefather
Iacono
Jones
Kwan
Lametti
Lapointe
Lebouthillier
Lightbound
MacGregor
Malcolmson
Mathyssen
McGuinty
McKenna
McLeod (Northwest Territories)
Mendicino
Miller (Ville Marie Le Sud Ouest Île des Soeurs)
Murray
Nault
O'Connell
Oliver
Ouellette
Peschisolido
Philpott
Poissant
Ramsey
Rodriguez
Romanado
Rumny
Saini
Sangha
Scarpaleggia
Schulte
Shanahan
Sidhu (Mission Matsqui Fraser Canyon)
Sikand
Sohi
Spengemann
Tan
Trudel
Vandenbeld
Whalen
Wrzesnewskyj
Young 139

Alleslev
Anandasangaree
Arya
Badawey
Bains
Beech
Bibeau
Boulerice
Caesar-Chavannes
Choquette
Cuzner
Dhaliwal
Drouin
Duclos
Duvall
Easter
El-Khoury
Eyking
Fergus
Fisher
Fortier
Fraser (West Nova)
Fry
Garneau
Graham
Hajdu
Hébert
Hogg
Hutchings
Johns
Khera
Lambropoulos
Lamoureux
Lauzon (Argenteuil La Petite Nation)
Levitt
Lockhart
MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Masse (Windsor West)
McCrimmon
McKay
McKinnon (Coquitlam Port Coquitlam)
Meraldi
Mihychuk
Ng
Oliphant
O'Regan
Paradis
Peterson
Picard
Qualtrough
Robillard
Rogers
Rudd
Sahota
Samson
Sarai
Schiefke
Serré
Sheehan
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Simms
Sorbara
Tabbara
Tassi
Vandal
Vaughan
Wilson-Raybould
Yip

NAYS

Members

Aboultaif
Albrecht
Barlow
Benzen
Brassard
Diotte
Eglinski
Fast
Genuis
Hoback
Kelly
Kitchen
Lake
Marcil
Motz
Poilievre
Rempel
Saroya
Schmale
Ste-Marie
Stubbs
Van Loan
Wagantall
Waugh
Yurdiga

Albas
Anderson
Barsalou-Duval
Boudrias
Cooper
Dreeshen
Falk (Battlefords Lloydminster)
Fortin
Harder
Jeneroux
Kent
Kmiec
Lobb
McCauley (Edmonton West)
Nater
Reid
Richards
Scheer
Sorenson
Strahl
Thériault
Viersen
Warkentin
Webber
Zimmer 50

PAIRED

Members

Beaulieu
Masse (Avignon La Mitis Matane Matapédia)
Plamondon
Wilkinson

Gill

Zahid 6

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 31 carried.

● (0220)

[*English*]

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 1—OFFICE OF THE CONFLICT OF INTEREST AND ETHICS COMMISSIONER

Hon. Scott Brison (President of the Treasury Board, Lib.) moved:

That Vote 1, in the amount of $6,134,141, under Office of the Conflict of Interest and Ethics Commissioner—Program expenditures, in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2019, be concurred in.

The Deputy Speaker: The question is on Motion No. 32. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Deputy Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And five or more members having risen:

● (0225)

[*Translation*]

(The House divided on Motion No. 32, which was agreed to on the following division:)

Business of Supply

(Division No. 793)

YEAS

Members

Aldag
Amos
Arseneault
Ayoub
Bagnell
Barsalou-Duval
Beech
Bibeau
Boudrias
Boutin-Sweet
Caesar-Chavannes
Choquette
Cuzner
Dhaliwal
Drouin
Duclos
Duvall
Easter
El-Khoury
Eyking
Fergus
Fisher
Fortier
Fragiskatos
Fraser (Central Nova)
Fuhr
Gerretsen
Grewal
Harvey
Hehr
Holland
Hutchings
Johns
Khera
Lambropoulos
Lamoureux
Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation)
Levitt
Lockhart
Malcolmson
Masse (Windsor West)
McCrimmon
McKay
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
Mendès
Mihychuk
Murray
O'Connell
Oliver
Ouellette
Peschisolido
Philpott
Poissant
Ramsey
Rodriguez
Romanado
Rumny
Saini
Sangha
Scarpaleggia
Schulte
Sgro
Sheehan
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Simms
Sorbara
Ste-Marie
Tan
Thériault
Vandal
Vaughan
Wilson-Raybould
Yip 145

Alleslev
Anandasangaree
Arya
Badawey
Bains
Baylis
Bennett
Blaney (North Island—Powell River)
Boulerice
Brison
Casey (Cumberland—Colchester)
Cormier
Damoff
Dhillon
Dubourg
Duguid
Dzerowicz
Ehsassi
Ellis
Evolfson
Fillmore
Fonseca
Fortin
Fraser (West Nova)
Fry
Garneau
Graham
Hajdu
Hebert
Hogg
Housefather
Iacono
Jones
Kwan
Lametti
Lapointe
Lebouthillier
Lightbound
MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Marcil
Mathyssen
McGuinty
McKenna
McLeod (Northwest Territories)
Mendicino
Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île-des-Sœurs)
Nault
Oliphant
O'Regan
Paradis
Peterson
Picard
Qualtrough
Robillard
Rogers
Rudd
Sahota
Samson
Sarai
Schiefke
Serré
Shanahan
Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)
Sikand
Sohi
Spengemann
Tabbara
Tassi
Trudel
Vandenbeld
Whalen
Wrzesnewskyj

NAYS

Members

Aboultaif
Albrecht
Barlow
Brassard
Diotte
Eglinski
Fast
Harder
Kent
Kmiec
Lobb
Motz
Poilievre
Rempel
Saroya
Schmale
Strahl
Van Loan
Wagantall
Waugh
Yurdiga

Albas
Anderson
Benzen
Cooper
Dreeshen
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Genuis
Hoback
Kitchen
Lake
McCauley (Edmonton West)
Nater
Reid
Richards
Scheer
Sorenson
Stubbs
Viersen
Warkentin
Webber
Zimmer 42

PAIRED

Members

Beaulieu
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)
Plamondon
Wilkinson

Gill
Zahid 6

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 32 carried.

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 1—OFFICE OF THE COMMUNICATIONS SECURITY ESTABLISHMENT COMMISSIONER

Hon. Scott Brison (President of the Treasury Board, Lib.) moved:

That Vote 1, in the amount of $1,954,662, under Office of the Communications Security Establishment Commissioner—Program expenditures, in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2019, be concurred in.

The Deputy Speaker: The question is on Motion No. 33. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Deputy Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And five or more members having risen:

● (0230)

[*English*]

(The House divided on Motion No. 33, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 794)

YEAS

Members

Aldag
Alleslev

Amos
Arya
Badawey
Bains
Beech
Bibeau
Bossio
Boutin-Sweet
Caesar-Chavannes
Chen
Cormier
Dabrusin
Dhaliwal
Dhillon
Dubourg
Duguid
Easter
El-Khoury
Erskine-Smith
Eyolfson
Fillmore
Fonseca
Fragiskatos
Fraser (Central Nova)
Fuhr
Gerretsen
Grewal
Harvey
Hehr
Holland
Hutchings
Johns
Khera
Lametti
Lapointe
Lebouthillier
Lightbound
Long
Ludwig
Malcolmson
Masse (Windsor West)
McCrimmon
McKay
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
Mendès
Mihychuk
Moore (Fundy Royal)
Murray
Ng
Oliphant
O'Regan
Paradis
Peterson
Picard
Qualtrough
Robillard
Romanado
Rota
Saini
Sangha
Scarpaleggia
Schulte
Sgro
Sheehan
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Simms
Sorbara
Tabbara
Tassi
Vandal
Vaughan
Wilson-Raybould
Yip — 143

Arseneault
Ayoub
Bagnell
Baylis
Bennett
Blaney (North Island—Powell River)
Boulerice
Brison
Casey (Cumberland—Colchester)
Choquette
Cuzner
Dhaliwal
Drouin
Duclos
Dzerowicz
Ehsassi
Ellis
Eyking
Fergus
Fisher
Fortier
Fraser (West Nova)
Fry
Gameau
Graham
Hajdu
Hébert
Hogg
Housefather
Iacono
Jones
Kwan
Lamoureux
Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation)
Levitt
Lockhart
Longfield
MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Maloney
Mathyssen
McGuinty
McKenna
McLeod (Northwest Territories)
Mendicino
Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île-des-Sœurs)
Nault
O'Connell
Oliver
Ouellette
Peschisolido
Philpott
Poissant
Ramsey
Rogers
Rudd
Sahota
Samson
Sarai
Schiefke
Serré
Shanahan
Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)
Sikand
Sohi
Spengemann
Tan
Trudel
Vandenbeld
Whalen
Wrzesnewskyj

NAYS

Members

Aboultaif
Albrecht
Anderson
Barsalou-Duval
Boudrias
Cooper
Dreeshen
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Fortin
Harder
Kent
Kmiec
Lobb
McCauley (Edmonton West)
Nater
Reid
Richards
Schmale
Ste-Marie
Stubbs
Van Loan
Wagantall
Waugh
Yurdiga
Fast
Genuis
Hoback
Kitchen
Lake
Marcil
Motz
Poilievre
Rempel
Saroya
Sorenson
Strahl
Thériault
Viersen
Warkentin
Webber
Zimmer — 48

PAIRED

Members

Beaulieu — Gill
Masse (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)—Plamondon
Wilkinson — Zahid — 6

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): I declare Motion No. 33 carried.

VOTE 1—PRIVY COUNCIL OFFICE

Hon. Scott Brison (President of the Treasury Board, Lib.) moved:

That Vote 1, in the amount of $150,284,051, under Privy Council Office—Program expenditures, in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2019, be concurred in.

[*Translation*]

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): The question is on Motion No. 34. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): In my opinion the yeas have it.

And five or more members having risen:

● (0235)

(The House divided on Motion No. 34, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 795)

YEAS

Members

Aldag
Allesley
Anandasangaree
Arya
Alghabra
Amos
Arseneault
Ayoub

Badawey
Bains
Beech
Bibeau
Blaney (North Island—Powell River)
Bossio
Boutin-Sweet
Breton
Caesar-Chavannes
Casey (Charlottetown)
Choquette
Cuzner
Dhaliwal
Duclos
Easter
Erskine-Smith
Eyolfson
Fillmore
Fonseca
Fragiskatos
Fraser (Central Nova)
Fuhr
Goldsmith-Jones
Grewal
Harvey
Hehr
Holland
Hutchings
Johns
Jones
Kwan
Lametti
Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite Nation)
Levitt
Long
Ludwig
Maloney
Mathyssen
McGuinty
McKenna
Mihychuk
Nault
O'Connell
O'Regan
Peschisolido
Petitpas Taylor
Picard
Ramsey
Robillard
Romanado
Sahota
Sajjan
Sangha
Scarpaleggia
Schulte
Sgro
Sheehan
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Simms
Spengemann
Tan
Trudel
Vandenbeld
Whalen
Wrzesnewskyj

Bagnell
Baylis
Bennett
Blair
Boissonnault
Boulerice
Bratina
Brison
Casey (Cumberland—Colchester)
Chen
Cormier
Dabrusin
Dubourg
Dzerowicz
Ellis
Eyking
Fergus
Fisher
Fortier
Fraser (West Nova)
Fry
Gerretsen
Graham
Hajdu
Hébert
Hogg
Housefather
Iacono
Joly
Khera
Lambropoulos
Lapointe
Lebouthillier
Lockhart
Longfield
Malcolmson
Masse (Windsor West)
May (Cambridge)
McKay
Mendès
Murray
Ng
Oliphant
Paradis
Peterson
Philpott
Poissant
Rioux
Rogers
Ruimy
Saini
Samson
Sarai
Schiefke
Serré
Shanahan
Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)
Sikand
Sorbara
Tabbara
Tassi
Vandal
Vaughan
Wilson-Raybould
Young — 138

NAYS

Members

Aboultaif
Albrecht
Anderson
Barsalou-Duval
Boudrias
Cooper
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Fortin
Harder
Kent
Kmiec
Lobb
McCauley (Edmonton West)
Nater

Albas
Allison
Barlow
Benzen
Brassard
Eglinski
Fast
Genuis
Hoback
Kitchen
Lake
Mareil
Motz
Paul-Hus

Poilievre
Richards
Schmale
Ste-Marie
Stubbs
Van Loan
Wagantall
Waugh
Yurdiga

Reid
Saroya
Sorenson
Strahl
Thériault
Viersen
Warkentin
Webber
Zimmer — 46

PAIRED

Members

Beaulieu — Gill
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)—Plamondon
Wilkinson — Zahid — 6

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): I declare Motion No. 34 carried.

● (0240)

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 1—OFFICE OF THE SENATE ETHICS OFFICER

Hon. Harjit S. Sajjan (for the President of the Treasury Board) moved:

That Vote 1, in the amount of $1,214,777, under Office of the Senate Ethics Officer—Program expenditures, in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2019, be concurred in.

[*English*]

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): The next question is on Motion No. 35.

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): In my opinion the yeas have it.

And five or more members having risen:

● (0245)

(The House divided on Motion No. 35, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 796)

YEAS

Members

Aldag
Alleslev
Anandasangaree
Arya
Badawey
Bains
Beech
Bibeau
Blaney (North Island—Powell River)
Bossio

Alghabra
Amos
Arseneault
Ayoub
Bagnell
Baylis
Bennett
Blair
Boissonnault
Boulerice

Boutin-Sweet
Breton
Casey (Cumberland—Colchester)
Champagne
Choquette
Cuzner
Dhaliwal
Duclos
Easter
Eyking
Fergus
Fisher
Fortier
Fraser (West Nova)
Fry
Gerretsen
Goodale
Grewal
Harvey
Hehr
Holland
Hutchings
Johns
Jones
Kwan
Lametti
Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite Nation)
Levitt
Long
Ludwig
Malcolmson
Masse (Windsor West)
May (Cambridge)
McKay
Mendès
Murray
Ng
Oliphant
Paradis
Peterson
Philpott
Poissant
Rioux
Rodriguez
Romanado
Sahota
Sajjan
Sangha
Sarai
Schiefke
Serré
Shanahan
Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)
Sikand
Sorbara
Tabbara
Trudel
Vandenbeld
Whalen
Wrzesnewskyj
Young — 141

Bratina
Caesar-Chavannes
Casey (Charlottetown)
Chen
Cormier
Dabrusin
Dubourg
Duvall
Erskine-Smith
Eyolfson
Fillmore
Fonseca
Fragiskatos
Fraser (Central Nova)
Fuhr
Goldsmith-Jones
Graham
Hajdu
Hébert
Hogg
Housefather
Iacono
Joly
Khera
Lambropoulos
Lapointe
Lebouthillier
Lockhart
Longfield
MacGregor
Maloney
Mathyssen
McGuinty
McKenna
Mihychuk
Nault
O'Connell
O'Regan
Peschisolido
Petitpas Taylor
Picard
Ramsey
Robillard
Rogers
Ruimy
Saini
Samson
Sansoucy
Scarpaleggia
Schulte
Sgro
Sheehan
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Simms
Spengemann
Tan
Vandal
Vaughan
Wilson-Raybould
Yip

NAYS

Members

Aboultaif
Albrecht
Anderson
Barsalou-Duval
Boudrias
Cooper
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Genuis
Hoback
Kitchen
Lake
Marcil
Motz
O'Toole
Poilievre
Richards
Schmale
Ste-Marie

Albas
Allison
Barlow
Benzen
Brassard
Eglinski
Fast
Harder
Kent
Kmiec
Lobb
McCauley (Edmonton West)
Nater
Paul-Hus
Reid
Saroya
Sorenson
Strahl

Stubbs
Van Loan
Wagantall
Waugh
Yurdiga

Thériault
Viersen
Warkentin
Webber
Zimmer — 46

PAIRED

Members

Beaulieu — Gill
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)—Plamondon
Wilkinson — Zahid — 6

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): I declare Motion No. 35 carried.

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 1—OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC PROSECUTIONS

Hon. Harjit S. Sajjan (for the President of the Treasury Board) moved:

That Vote 1, in the amount of $162,190,770, under Office of the Director of Public Prosecutions—Program expenditures, in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2019, be concurred in.

[*Translation*]

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): The question is on Motion No. 36. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): In my opinion the yeas have it.

And five or more members having risen:

● (0250)

(The House divided on Motion No. 36, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 797)

YEAS

Members

Aldag
Alleslev
Anandasangaree
Arya
Badawey
Bains
Beech
Bibeau
Blaney (North Island—Powell River)
Bossio
Boutin-Sweet
Breton
Casey (Cumberland—Colchester)
Champagne
Choquette

Alghabra
Amos
Arseneault
Ayoub
Bagnell
Baylis
Bennett
Blair
Boissonnault
Boulerice
Bratina
Caesar-Chavannes
Casey (Charlottetown)
Chen
Cormier

Cuzner
DeCourcey
Dubourg
Duvall
Erskine-Smith
Eyolfson
Fillmore
Fonseca
Fragiskatos
Fraser (Central Nova)
Fuhr
Goldsmith-Jones
Graham
Hajdu
Hébert
Hogg
Housefather
Iacono
Joly
Khera
Lambropoulos
Lapointe
Lebouthillier
Lockhart
Longfield
MacGregor
Maloney
Mathyssen
McGuinty
McKenna
Murray
Ng
Oliphant
Paradis
Peterson
Philpott
Poissant
Rioux
Rodriguez
Romanado
Sahota
Sajjan
Sangha
Sarai
Schiefke
Serré
Shanahan
Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)
Sikand
Sohara
Tabbara
Trudel
Vandenbeld
Whalen
Wrzesnewskyj
Young — 141

Dabrusin
Dhaliwal
Duclos
Easter
Eyking
Fergus
Fisher
Fortier
Fraser (West Nova)
Fry
Gerretsen
Goodale
Grewal
Harvey
Hehr
Holland
Hutchings
Johns
Jones
Kwan
Lametti
Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation)
Levitt
Long
Ludwig
Malcolmson
Masse (Windsor West)
May (Cambridge)
McKay
Mihychuk
Nault
O'Connell
O'Regan
Peschisolido
Petitpas Taylor
Picard
Ramsey
Robillard
Rogers
Ruimy
Saini
Samson
Sansoucy
Scarpaleggia
Schulte
Sgro
Sheehan
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Simms
Spengemann
Tan
Vandal
Vaughan
Wilson-Raybould
Yip

NAYS

Members

Aboultaif
Albrecht
Anderson
Barsalou-Duval
Boudrias
Cooper
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Genuis
Jeneroux
Kitchen
Lobb
McCauley (Edmonton West)
Nater
Paul-Hus
Reid
Saroya
Sorenson
Strahl
Thériault
Viersen
Warkentin
Webber

Albas
Allison
Barlow
Benzen
Brassard
Eglinski
Fast
Harder
Kent
Lake
Marcil
Motz
O'Toole
Poilievre
Richards
Schmale
Ste-Marie
Stubbs
Van Loan
Wagantall
Waugh
Zimmer — 44

PAIRED

Members

Beaulieu — Gill
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)—Plamondon
Wilkinson — Zahid — 6

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): I declare Motion No. 36 carried.

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 1—OFFICE OF THE CHIEF ELECTORAL OFFICER

Hon. Harjit S. Sajjan (for the President of the Treasury Board) moved:

That Vote 1, in the amount of $30,768,921, under Office of the Chief Electoral Officer—Program expenditures, in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2019, be concurred in.

● (0255)

[*English*]

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): The question is on Motion No. 37. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): In my opinion the yeas have it.

And five or more members having risen:

(The House divided on Motion No. 37, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 798)

YEAS

Members

Aldag
Alleslev
Anandasangaree
Arya
Badawey
Baylis
Bennett
Blaney (North Island—Powell River)
Bossio
Boutin-Sweet
Breton
Casey (Cumberland—Colchester)
Champagne
Choquette
Cuzner
DeCourcey
Dubourg
Duvall
Ellis
Eyking
Fergus

Alghabra
Amos
Arseneault
Ayoub
Bagnell
Beech
Blair
Boissonnault
Boulerice
Bratina
Caesar-Chavannes
Casey (Charlottetown)
Chen
Cormier
Dabrusin
Dhaliwal
Duclos
Easter
Erskine-Smith
Eyolfson
Fillmore

Fisher
Fortier
Fraser (West Nova)
Fry
Gerretsen
Goodale
Grewal
Harvey
Hehr
Holland
Hutchings
Johns
Jones
Kwan
Lametti
Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation)
Levitt
Long
Ludwig
Malcolmson
Masse (Windsor West)
May (Cambridge)
McKay
Mihychuk
Nault
O'Connell
O'Regan
Peschisolido
Petitpas Taylor
Picard
Ramsey
Robillard
Rogers
Rumiy
Saini
Samson
Sansoucy
Scarpaleggia
Schulte
Sgro
Sheehan
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Simms
Spengemann
Tabbara
Thériault
Vandal
Whalen
Wrzesnewskyj
Young — 141

Fonseca
Fragiskatos
Fraser (Central Nova)
Fuhr
Goldsmith-Jones
Graham
Hajdu
Hébert
Hogg
Housefather
Iacono
Joly
Khera
Lambropoulos
Lapointe
Lebouthillier
Lockhart
Longfield
MacGregor
Maloney
Mathyssen
McGuinty
McKenna
Murray
Ng
Oliphant
Paradis
Peterson
Philpott
Poissant
Rioux
Rodriguez
Romanado
Sahota
Sajjan
Sangha
Sarai
Schiefke
Serré
Shanahan
Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)
Sikand
Sorbara
Ste-Marie
Tan
Trudel
Vaughan
Wilson-Raybould
Yip

NAYS

Members

Aboultaif
Albrecht
Anderson
Barsalou-Duval
Boudrias
Cooper
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Genuis
Jeneroux
Kitchen
Lobb
McCauley (Edmonton West)
Nater
Paul-Hus
Reid
Saroya
Sorenson
Van Loan
Warkentin
Webber
Zimmer — 41

Albas
Allison
Barlow
Benzen
Brassard
Eglinski
Fast
Harder
Kent
Lake
Marcil
Motz
O'Toole
Poilievre
Richards
Schmale
Stubbs
Wagantall
Waugh
Yurdiga

PAIRED

Members

Beaulieu — Gill
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)
Plamondon — Wilkinson — Zahid — 6

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): I declare Motion No. 37 carried.

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 1—OFFICE OF THE PARLIAMENTARY BUDGET OFFICER

Hon. Harjit S. Sajjan (for the President of the Treasury Board) moved:

That Vote 1, in the amount of $6,983,524, under Office of the Parliamentary Budget Officer—Program expenditures, in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2019, be concurred in.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): The question is on Motion No. 38.

[*Translation*]

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): In my opinion the yeas have it.

And five or more members having risen:

● (0300)

(The House divided on Motion No. 38, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 799)

YEAS

Members

Aldag
Alleslev
Anandasangaree
Arya
Badawey
Baylis
Bennett
Blair
Boissonnault
Boulerice
Bratina
Caesar-Chavannes
Casey (Charlottetown)
Chen
Cormier
Dabrusin
Dhaliwal
Duclos
Easter
Ellis
Eyking
Fergus
Fisher
Fortier
Fragiskatos
Fraser (Central Nova)
Gerretsen

Alghabra
Amos
Arseneault
Ayoub
Bagnell
Beech
Bibeau
Blaney (North Island—Powell River)
Bossio
Boutin-Sweet
Breton
Casey (Cumberland—Colchester)
Champagne
Choquette
Cuzner
DeCourcey
Dubourg
Duvall
Ehsassi
Erskine-Smith
Eyolfson
Fillmore
Fonseca
Fortin
Fraser (West Nova)
Fuhr
Goldsmith-Jones

Goodale	Graham
Grewal	Hajdu
Harvey	Hébert
Hehr	Hogg
Holland	Housefather
Hutchings	Iacono
Johns	Joly
Jones	Khera
Kwan	Lambropoulos
Lametti	Lapointe
Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite Nation)	Lebouthillier
Levitt	Lockhart
Long	Longfield
Ludwig	MacGregor
Malcolmson	Maloney
Masse (Windsor West)	Mathyssen
May (Cambridge)	McGuinty
McKay	McKenna
Mihychuk	Murray
Nault	Ng
O'Connell	Oliphant
O'Regan	Paradis
Peschisolido	Peterson
Petitpas Taylor	Philpott
Picard	Poissant
Ramsey	Rioux
Robillard	Rodriguez
Rogers	Romanado
Ruimy	Sahota
Saini	Sajjan
Samson	Sangha
Sansoucy	Sarai
Scarpaleggia	Schiefke
Schulte	Serré
Sgro	Shanahan
Sheehan	Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)
Sidhu (Brampton South)	Sikand
Simms	Sorbara
Spengemann	Ste-Marie
Tabbara	Tan
Thériault	Trudel
Vandal	Vandenbeld
Vaughan	Whalen
Wilson-Raybould	Wrzesnewskyj
Yip	Young — 144

NAYS

Members

Aboultaif	Albas
Albrecht	Allison
Anderson	Barlow
Barsalou-Duval	Benzen
Boudrias	Brassard
Cooper	Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Fast	Genuis
Harder	Jeneroux
Kent	Kmiec
Lake	Lobb
Marcil	McCauley (Edmonton West)
Motz	Nater
O'Toole	Paul-Hus
Reid	Richards
Saroya	Schmale
Sorenson	Stubbs
Van Loan	Wagantall
Warkentin	Waugh
Webber	Yurdiga — 38

PAIRED

Members

Beaulieu	Gill
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)	
Plamondon	
Wilkinson	Zahid — 6

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): I declare Motion No. 38 carried.

● (0305)

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 1—OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY TO THE GOVERNOR GENERAL

Hon. Harjit S. Sajjan (for the President of the Treasury Board) moved:

That Vote 1, in the amount of $19,986,309, under Office of the Governor General's Secretary—Program expenditures, in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2019, be concurred in.

[*English*]

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): The question is on Motion No. 39. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): In my opinion the yeas have it.

And five or more members having risen:

● (0310)

(The House divided on Motion No. 39, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 800)

YEAS

Members

Aldag	Alghabra
Allesley	Amos
Anandasangaree	Arseneault
Arya	Ayoub
Badawey	Bagnell
Bains	Baylis
Beech	Bennett
Bibeau	Blair
Blaney (North Island—Powell River)	Boissonnault
Bossio	Boulerice
Boutin-Sweet	Bratina
Breton	Caesar-Chavannes
Casey (Cumberland—Colchester)	Casey (Charlottetown)
Champagne	Chen
Choquette	Cormier
Cuzner	Dabrusin
DeCourcey	Dhaliwal
Dubourg	Duclos
Duvall	Easter
Ehsassi	Ellis
Erskine-Smith	Eyking
Eyolfson	Fergus
Fillmore	Fisher
Fonseca	Fortier
Fragiskatos	Fraser (West Nova)
Fraser (Central Nova)	Fuhr
Gerretsen	Goldsmith-Jones
Goodale	Graham
Grewal	Hajdu
Harvey	Hébert
Hehr	Hogg

Holland	Housefather
Hutchings	Iacono
Johns	Joly
Jones	Khera
Lambropoulos	Lametti
Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite Nation)	Leslie
Levitt	Lockhart
Long	Longfield
Ludwig	MacGregor
Maloney	Masse (Windsor West)
Mathyssen	May (Cambridge)
McGuinty	McKay
McKenna	Mendès
Mihychuk	Murray
Nault	Ng
O'Connell	Oliphant
O'Regan	Paradis
Peschisolido	Peterson
Petitpas Taylor	Philpott
Picard	Poissant
Ramsey	Rioux
Robillard	Rodriguez
Rogers	Romanado
Ruimy	Sahota
Saini	Sajjan
Samson	Sangha
Sansoucy	Sarai
Scarpaleggia	Schiefke
Schulte	Serré
Sgro	Shanahan
Sheehan	Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)
Sidhu (Brampton South)	Sikand
Simms	Sorbara
Spengemann	Tabbara
Tan	Trudel
Vandal	Vandenbeld
Vaughan	Whalen
Wilson-Raybould	Wrzesnewskyj
Yip	Young — 140

NAYS

Members

Aboultaif	Albas
Albrecht	Allison
Anderson	Barlow
Barsalou-Duval	Benzen
Boudrias	Brassard
Cooper	Eglinski
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)	Fast
Fortin	Genuis
Harder	Jeneroux
Kent	Kmiec
Lake	Lobb
Marcil	McCauley (Edmonton West)
Motz	Nater
O'Toole	Paul-Hus
Reid	Richards
Saroya	Schmale
Sorenson	Ste-Marie
Stubbs	Thériault
Van Loan	Wagantall
Warkentin	Waugh
Webber	Yurdiga — 42

PAIRED

Members

Beaulieu	Gill
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)	
Plamondon	
Wilkinson	Zahid — 6

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): I declare motion No. 39 carried.

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 1—OFFICE OF THE SUPERINTENDENT OF FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Hon. Harjit S. Sajjan (for the President of the Treasury Board) moved:

Business of Supply

That Vote 1, in the amount of $945,058, under Office of the Superintendent of Financial Institutions—Program expenditures, in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2019, be concurred in.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): The question is on Motion No. 40. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): In my opinion the yeas have it.

And five or more members having risen:

● (0315)

[*Translation*]

(The House divided on Motion No. 40, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 801)

YEAS

Members

Aldag	Alghabra
Alleslev	Amos
Anandasangaree	Arseneault
Arya	Ayoub
Badawey	Bagnell
Bains	Baylis
Beech	Bennett
Bibeau	Blair
Blaney (North Island—Powell River)	Boissonnault
Bossio	Boulerice
Boutin-Sweet	Bratina
Breton	Caesar-Chavannes
Casey (Cumberland—Colchester)	Casey (Charlottetown)
Champagne	Chen
Choquette	Cormier
Cuzner	Dabrusin
DeCourcey	Dhaliwal
Dubourg	Duclos
Duvall	Easter
Ehsassi	Ellis
Erskine-Smith	Eyking
Eyolfson	Fergus
Fillmore	Fisher
Fonseca	Fortier
Fragiskatos	Fraser (West Nova)
Fraser (Central Nova)	Fry
Fuhr	Gerretsen
Goldsmith-Jones	Goodale
Graham	Grewal
Hajdu	Harvey
Hébert	Hehr
Hogg	Holland
Housefather	Hutchings
Iacono	Johns
Joly	Jones
Khera	Lambropoulos
Lapointe	Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite Nation)
Lebouthillier	Leslie
Levitt	Lockhart

Long	Longfield
Ludwig	MacGregor
Maloney	Masse (Windsor West)
Mathyssen	May (Cambridge)
McGuinty	McKay
McKenna	Mendès
Mihychuk	Murray
Nault	Ng
O'Connell	Oliphant
O'Regan	Paradis
Peschisolido	Peterson
Petitpas Taylor	Philpott
Picard	Poissant
Ramsey	Rioux
Robillard	Rodriguez
Rogers	Romanado
Rumy	Sahota
Saini	Sajjan
Samson	Sangha
Sansoucy	Sarai
Scarpaleggia	Schiefke
Schulte	Serré
Sgro	Shanahan
Sheehan	Sidhu (Mission — Matsqui — Fraser Canyon)
Sidhu (Brampton South)	Sikand
Simms	Sorbara
Spengemann	Tabbara
Tan	Trudel
Vandal	Vandenbeld
Vaughan	Whalen
Wilson-Raybould	Wrzesnewskyj
Yip	Young — 142

NAYS

Members

Aboultaif	Albas
Albrecht	Allison
Anderson	Barlow
Barsalou-Duval	Benzen
Boudrias	Brassard
Cooper	Eglinski
Fast	Fortin
Genuis	Harder
Hoback	Jeneroux
Kent	Kmiec
Lake	Lobb
Marcil	McCauley (Edmonton West)
Motz	Nater
O'Toole	Paul-Hus
Reid	Richards
Saroya	Schmale
Sorenson	Ste-Marie
Stubbs	Thériault
Van Loan	Wagantall
Warkentin	Waugh
Webber	Yurdiga — 42

PAIRED

Members

Beaulieu	Gill
Massé (Avignon — La Mitis — Matane — Matapédia)	
Plamondon	
Wilkinson	Zahid — 6

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): I declare Motion No. 40 carried.

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 1—OFFICE OF THE AUDITOR GENERAL

Hon. Harjit S. Sajjan (for the President of the Treasury Board) moved:

That Vote 1, in the amount of $69,027,524, under Office of the Auditor General—Program expenditures, in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2019, be concurred in.

[*English*]

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): The question is on Motion No. 41. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): In my opinion the yeas have it.

And five or more members having risen:

● (0320)

[*Translation*]

(The House divided on Motion No. 41, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 802)

YEAS

Members

Aldag	Alghabra
Allesley	Amos
Anandasangaree	Arseneault
Arya	Ayoub
Badawey	Bagnell
Bains	Baylis
Beech	Bennett
Bibeau	Blair
Blaney (North Island — Powell River)	Boissonnault
Bossio	Boulerice
Boutin-Sweet	Bratina
Breton	Caesar-Chavannes
Casey (Cumberland — Colchester)	Casey (Charlottetown)
Champagne	Chen
Choquette	Cormier
Cuzner	Dabrusin
DeCourcey	Dhaliwal
Dubourg	Duclos
Easter	Ehsassi
Ellis	Erskine-Smith
Eyking	Eyolfson
Fergus	Fillmore
Fisher	Fonseca
Fortier	Fortin
Fragiskatos	Fraser (West Nova)
Fraser (Central Nova)	Fry
Fuhr	Gerretsen
Goldsmith-Jones	Goodale
Graham	Grewal
Hajdu	Harvey
Hébert	Hehr
Hogg	Holland
Hutchings	Iacono
Johns	Joly
Jones	Khera
Lambropoulos	Lametti
Lapointe	Lauzon (Argenteuil — La Petite Nation)
Lebouthillier	Leslie
Levitt	Lockhart
Long	Longfield
Ludwig	MacGregor

Malcolmson	Maloney
Masse (Windsor West)	Mathyssen
May (Cambridge)	McGuinty
McKay	McKenna
Mendès	Mihychuk
Murray	Nault
Ng	O'Connell
Oliphant	O'Regan
Paradis	Peschisolido
Peterson	Petitpas Taylor
Philpott	Picard
Poissant	Ramsey
Rioux	Robillard
Rodriguez	Rogers
Romanado	Rumny
Sahota	Saini
Sajjan	Samson
Sangha	Sansoucy
Sarai	Scarpaleggia
Schiefke	Schulte
Serré	Sgro
Shanahan	Sheehan
Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)	Sidhu (Brampton South)
Sikand	Simms
Sorbara	Spengemann
Ste-Marie	Tabbara
Tan	Thériault
Trudel	Vandal
Vandenbeld	Vaughan
Whalen	Wilson-Raybould
Wrzesnewskyj	Yip
Young — 145	

NAYS

Members

Aboultaif	Albas
Albrecht	Allison
Anderson	Benzen
Boudrias	Brassard
Cooper	Eglinski
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)	Fast
Gennis	Harder
Hoback	Jeneroux
Kent	Kmiec
Lake	Lobb
Marcil	McCauley (Edmonton West)
Motz	Nater
O'Toole	Paul-Hus
Reid	Richards
Saroya	Schmale
Sorenson	Strahl
Stubbs	Van Loan
Wagantall	Waugh
Webber	Yurdiga — 38

PAIRED

Members

Beaulieu	Gill
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)	
Plamondon	
Wilkinson	Zahid — 6

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): I declare Motion No. 41 carried.

[*English*]

VOTE 1—CANADIAN CENTRE FOR OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH AND SAFETY

Hon. Harjit S. Sajjan (for the President of the Treasury Board) moved:

That Vote 1, in the amount of $4,111,237, under Canadian Centre for Occupational Health and Safety—Program expenditures, in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2019, be concurred in.

● (0325)

[*Translation*]

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): The question is on Motion No. 42. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): In my opinion the yeas have it.

And five or more members having risen:

● (0330)

(The House divided on Motion No. 42, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 803)

YEAS

Members

Aldag	Alghabra
Alleslev	Amos
Anandasangaree	Arseneault
Arya	Ayoub
Badawey	Bagnell
Bains	Baylis
Beech	Bennett
Bibeau	Blaikie
Blair	Blaney (North Island—Powell River)
Boissonnault	Bossio
Boulerice	Boutin-Sweet
Bratina	Breton
Caesar-Chavannes	Casey (Cumberland—Colchester)
Casey (Charlottetown)	Champagne
Chen	Choquette
Cormier	Cuzner
Dabrusin	DeCourcey
Dhaliwal	Dubourg
Duclos	Easter
Ehsassi	Ellis
Erskine-Smith	Eyking
Eyolfson	Fergus
Fillmore	Fisher
Fonseca	Fortier
Fragiskatos	Fraser (West Nova)
Fraser (Central Nova)	Fry
Fuhr	Gerretsen
Goldsmith-Jones	Goodale
Grewal	Hajdu
Harvey	Hébert
Hehr	Hogg
Holland	Housefather
Hutchings	Iacono
Johns	Joly
Jones	Khera
Kwan	Lambropoulos
Lametti	Lapointe
Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation)	Lebouthillier
Leslie	Levitt
Lockhart	Long
Longfield	Ludwig

MacGregor
Maloney
Mathyssen
McCrimmon
McKay
Mendès
Murray
Ng
O'Regan
Peschisolido
Petitpas Taylor
Picard
Ramsey
Robillard
Rogers
Ruimy
Saini
Samson
Sansoucy
Scarpaleggia
Schulte
Shanahan
Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)
Sikand
Sorbara
Tabbara
Trudel
Vandenbeld
Whalen
Wrzesnewskyj
Young — 143

Malcolmson
Masse (Windsor West)
May (Cambridge)
McGuinty
McKenna
Mihychuk
Nault
Oliphant
Paradis
Peterson
Philpott
Poissant
Rioux
Rodriguez
Romanado
Sahota
Sajjan
Sangha
Sarai
Schiefke
Serré
Sheehan
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Simms
Spengemann
Tan
Vandal
Vaughan
Wilson-Raybould
Yip

NAYS

Members

Aboultaif
Albrecht
Anderson
Benzen
Brassard
Eglinski
Fast
Genuis
Hoback
Kent
Lake
Marcil
Motz
O'Toole
Poilievre
Richards
Schmale
Ste-Marie
Stubbs
Van Loan
Waugh
Yurdiga

Albas
Allison
Barsalou-Duval
Boudrias
Cooper
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Fortin
Harder
Jeneroux
Kmiec
Lobb
McCauley (Edmonton West)
Nater
Paul-Hus
Reid
Saroya
Sorenson
Strahl
Thériault
Wagantall
Webber
Zimmer — 44

PAIRED

Members

Beaulieu
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)
Plamondon
Wilkinson

Gill

Zahid — 6

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): I declare Motion No. 42 carried.

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 1—FINANCIAL TRANSACTIONS AND REPORTS ANALYSIS CENTRE OF CANADA

Hon. Harjit S. Sajjan (for the President of the Treasury Board) moved:

That Vote 1, in the amount of $46,614,069, under Financial Transactions and Reports Analysis Centre of Canada—Program expenditures, in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2019, be concurred in.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): The question is on Motion No. 43. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): In my opinion the yeas have it.

And five or more members having risen, the House proceeded to the vote.

Before the Clerk announced the results of the vote:

● (0335)

[*English*]

Mr. Tom Kmiec: Madam Speaker, I think we have an unfortunate situation. When the roll call was made by the table officers, the Minister of Families, Children and Social Development was named as having voted, but he is not in his seat at the moment. I would like the table to verify whether he was recorded as voting in the affirmative. Since he is not in his seat, I believe that the rules of the House call for his vote not being recorded as his having voted yes.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): The member will not be counted. His vote will not count.

[*Translation*]

(The House divided on Motion No. 43, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 804)

YEAS

Members

Aldag
Alleslev
Anandasangaree
Arya
Bagnell
Baylis
Bennett
Blair
Boissonnault
Boulerice
Bratina
Casey (Cumberland—Colchester)
Champagne
Choquette
Dabrusin
DeCourcey
Dubourg
Duvall
Ehsassi
Eyking
Fortier
Fraser (West Nova)
Fry
Garneau

Alghabra
Amos
Arseneault
Badawey
Bains
Beech
Blaikie
Blaney (North Island—Powell River)
Bossio
Boutin-Sweet
Breton
Casey (Charlottetown)
Chen
Cuzner
Damoff
Dhaliwal
Duguid
Easter
El-Khoury
Fillmore
Fragiskatos
Fraser (Central Nova)
Fuhr
Gerretsen

Goldsmith-Jones	Goodale
Grewal	Hajdu
Harvey	Hébert
Hehr	Hogg
Holland	Housefather
Hutchings	Iacono
Johns	Joly
Jones	Kwan
Lambropoulos	Lametti
Lapointe	Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation)
Leslie	Levitt
Long	Longfield
Ludwig	MacGregor
MacKinnon (Gatineau)	Malcolmson
Maloney	Masse (Windsor West)
May (Cambridge)	McCrimmon
McGuinty	McKay
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)	McLeod (Northwest Territories)
Mendès	Mihychuk
Ng	Oliphant
O'Regan	Paradis
Peschisolido	Petitpas Taylor
Philpott	Qualtrough
Ramsey	Rioux
Rogers	Romanado
Rudd	Sahota
Sajjan	Samson
Sansoucy	Scarpaleggia
Schiefke	Schulte
Serré	Shanahan
Sheehan	Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)
Sidhu (Brampton South)	Sikand
Simms	Sorbara
Spengemann	Tabbara
Tan	Tassi
Trudel	Vandal
Vandenbeld	Whalen
Yip — 123	

NAYS

Members

Aboultaif	Albas
Albrecht	Allison
Anderson	Barlow
Barsalou-Duval	Benzen
Brassard	Cooper
Eglinski	Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Fast	Fortin
Genuis	Harder
Hoback	Jeneroux
Kent	Kmiec
Lake	Lobb
Marcil	Motz
Nater	O'Toole
Paul-Hus	Poilievre
Reid	Richards
Saroya	Schmale
Sorenson	Ste-Marie
Strahl	Stubbs
Thériault	Van Loan
Wagantall	Warkentin
Waugh	Webber
Yurdiga	Zimmer — 44

PAIRED

Members

Beaulieu	Gill
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia) Plamondon	
Wilkinson	Zahid — 6

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): I declare Motion No. 43 carried.

Business of Supply

[*English*]

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 1—COMMUNICATIONS SECURITY ESTABLISHMENT

Hon. Harjit S. Sajjan (for the President of the Treasury Board) moved:

That Vote 1, in the amount of $587,881,292, under Communications Security Establishment—Program expenditures, in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2019, be concurred in.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): The question is on Motion No. 44. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes) In my opinion, the yeas have it.

And five or more members having risen:

● (0340)

[*Translation*]

(The House divided on Motion No. 44, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 805)

YEAS

Members

Aldag	Alghabra
Alleslev	Amos
Anandasangaree	Arseneault
Arya	Badawey
Bagnell	Bains
Baylis	Beech
Bennett	Blaikie
Blair	Boissonnault
Bossio	Boulerice
Boutin-Sweet	Bratina
Breton	Casey (Cumberland—Colchester)
Casey (Charlottetown)	Champagne
Chen	Choquette
Cuzner	Dabrusin
Damoff	DeCourcey
Dhaliwal	Drouin
Dubourg	Duguid
Duvall	Dzerowicz
Easter	Ehsassi
Eyking	Fillmore
Fortier	Fragiskatos
Fraser (West Nova)	Fraser (Central Nova)
Fry	Fuhr
Garneau	Gerretsen
Goldsmith-Jones	Goodale
Graham	Grewal
Hajdu	Harvey
Hébert	Hehr
Hogg	Holland
Housefather	Hutchings
Iacono	Johns

Jody	Jones
Kwan	Lambropoulos
Lametti	Lapointe
Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation)	Leslie
Levitt	Lightbound
Long	Longfield
Ludwig	MacGregor
MacKinnon (Gatineau)	Maloney
Masse (Windsor West)	May (Cambridge)
McCrimmon	McGuinty
McKay	McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
McLeod (Northwest Territories)	Mendès
Mendicino	Mihychuk
Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île-des-Sœurs)	
Nault	
Ng	Oliphant
Oliver	O'Regan
Paradis	Peschisolido
Petitpas Taylor	Qualtrough
Ramsey	Rioux
Rogers	Romanado
Rudd	Sajjan
Sansoucy	Scarpaleggia
Schiefke	Schulte
Serré	Sgro
Shanahan	Sheehan
Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)	Sidhu (Brampton South)
Sikand	Simms
Sorbara	Spengemann
Tabbara	Tan
Tassi	Trudel
Vandal	Vandenbeld
Whalen	Yip — 126

NAYS

Members

Aboultaif	Albas
Albrecht	Allison
Barlow	Barsalou-Duval
Benzen	Brassard
Cooper	Eglinski
Fast	Fortin
Genuis	Harder
Hoback	Jeneroux
Kent	Kmiec
Lake	Lloyd
Lobb	Marcil
Motz	O'Toole
Paul-Hus	Poilievre
Richards	Saroya
Schmale	Sorenson
Ste-Marie	Strahl
Stubbs	Thériault
Van Loan	Wagantall
Warkentin	Waugh
Webber	Yurdiga
Zimmer — 41	

PAIRED

Members

Beaulieu	Gill
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)	
Plamondon	
Wilkinson	Zahid — 6

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): I declare Motion No. 44 carried.

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 1—INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT RESEARCH CENTRE

Hon. Scott Brison (President of the Treasury Board, Lib.) moved:

That Vote 1, in the amount of $139,338,189, under International Development Research Centre—Payments to the International Development Research Centre, in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2019, be concurred in.

[English]

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): The question is on Motion No. 45. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): In my opinion the yeas have it.

And five or more members having risen:

● (0345)

(The House divided on Motion No. 45, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 806)

YEAS

Members

Alday	Alghabra
Allesley	Amos
Anandasangaree	Arseneault
Arya	Ayoub
Badawey	Bagnell
Bains	Baylis
Beech	Bennett
Blaikie	Blair
Boissonnault	Bossio
Bouferice	Boutin-Sweet
Bratina	Breton
Brison	Casey (Cumberland—Colchester)
Casey (Charlottetown)	Champagne
Chen	Choquette
Cuzner	Dabrusin
Damoff	DeCourcey
Dhaliwal	Dhillon
Drouin	Dubourg
Duguid	Duvall
Dzerowicz	Easter
Ehsassi	Eyking
Fillmore	Fortier
Fragiskatos	Fraser (West Nova)
Fraser (Central Nova)	Fry
Fuhr	Garneau
Gerretsen	Goldsmith-Jones
Goodale	Graham
Grewal	Hajdu
Harvey	Hebert
Hehr	Hogg
Holland	Housefather
Hutchings	Iacono
Johns	Jody
Jones	Kwan
Lambropoulos	Lametti
Lamoureux	Lapointe
Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation)	Leslie
Levitt	Lightbound
Long	Longfield
Ludwig	MacGregor
MacKinnon (Gatineau)	Malcolmson
Maloney	Masse (Windsor West)
May (Cambridge)	McCrimmon

McGuinty
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
Mendès
Mihychuk
Soeurs)
Nault
Oliphant
O'Regan
Paradis
Pettipas Taylor
Qualtrough
Raoux
Romanado
Sajjan
Scarpaleggia
Schulte
Sgro
Sheehan
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Simms
Sorbara
Tabbara
Tassi
Vandal
Whalen

McKay
McLeod (Northwest Territories)
Mendicino
Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île-des
Ng
Oliver
Ouellette
Peschisolido
Philpott
Ramsey
Rogers
Rudd
Sansoucy
Schuerke
Serré
Shanahan
Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)
Sikand
Sohi
Spengemann
Tan
Trudel
Vandenbeld
Yip — 134

NAYS

Members

Aboultaif
Albrecht
Barlow
Benzen
Cooper
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Fortin
Harder
Jeneroux
Kmiec
Lobb
McCauley (Edmonton West)
Nater
O'Toole
Poilievre
Saroya
Sorenson
Strahl
Thérault
Wagantall
Waugh
Yurdiga

Albas
Allison
Barsalou-Duval
Brassard
Eglinski
Fast
Genuis
Hoback
Kent
Lake
Marcil
Motz
Nuttall
Paul-Hus
Richards
Schmale
Ste-Marie
Stubbs
Van Loan
Warkentin
Webber
Zimmer — 44

PAIRED

Members

Beaulieu — Gill
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)
Plamondon
Wilkinson — Zahid — 6

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): Motion No. 45 agreed to

I declare Motion No. 45 carried.

● (0350)

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 1—HOUSE OF COMMONS

Hon. Scott Brison (President of the Treasury Board, Lib.) moved:

That Vote 1, in the amount of $347,004,325, under House of Commons—Program expenditures and contributions, in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2019, be concurred in.

[*Translation*]

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): The question is on Motion No. 46. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): In my opinion the yeas have it.

And five or more members having risen:

● (0355)

(The House divided on Motion No. 46, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 807)

YEAS

Members

Aldag
Alleslev
Anandasangaree
Arya
Badawey
Bains
Beech
Blaikie
Blaney (North Island—Powell River)
Bossio
Boutin-Sweet
Breton
Casey (Cumberland—Colchester)
Champagne
Choquette
Damoff
Dhaliwal
Drouin
Dugrud
Dzerowicz
Ehsassi
Eyking
Fortier
Fraser (West Nova)
Fry
Garneau
Goldsmith-Jones
Graham
Hajdu
Hébert
Hogg
Housefather
Iacono
Joly
Kwan
Lametti
Lapointe
Leslie
Lightbound
Longfield
MacGregor
Malcolmson
May (Cambridge)
McGuinty
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
Mendès
Mihychuk
Soeurs)
Nault
Oliphant

Alghabra
Amos
Arseneault
Ayoub
Bagnell
Baylis
Bennett
Blair
Boissonnault
Boulerice
Bratina
Brison
Casey (Charlottetown)
Chen
Dabrusin
DeCourcey
Dhillon
Dubourg
Duvall
Easter
El-Khoury
Fillmore
Fragiskatos
Fraser (Central Nova)
Fuhr
Gerretsen
Goodale
Grewal
Harvey
Hehr
Holland
Hutchings
Johns
Jones
Lambropoulos
Lamoureux
Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation)
Levitt
Long
Ludwig
MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Maloney
McCrimmon
McKay
McLeod (Northwest Territories)
Mendicino
Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île-des
Ng
Oliver

O'Regan	Ouellette
Paradis	Peschisolido
Petitpas Taylor	Philpott
Qualtrough	Rioux
Rogers	Romanado
Rudd	Sajjan
Sansoucy	Scarpaleggia
Schiefke	Schulte
Serre	Sgro
Shanahan	Sheehan
Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)	Sidhu (Brampton South)
Sikand	Simms
Sohi	Sorbara
Spengemann	Tabbara
Tan	Tassi
Trudel	Vandal
Vandenbeld	Whalen
Yip — 133	

NAYS

Members

Aboultaif	Albas
Albrecht	Allison
Barlow	Barsalou-Duval
Benzen	Boudrias
Cooper	Eglinski
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)	Fortin
Gennis	Harder
Hoback	Jeneroux
Kent	Kmiec
Lake	Lobb
Marcil	McCauley (Edmonton West)
Motz	Nater
Nuttall	Paul-Hus
Poilievre	Rempel
Richards	Saroya
Schmale	Sorenson
Ste-Marie	Strahl
Stubbs	Van Loan
Wagantall	Warkentin
Waugh	Webber
Yurdiga — 41	

PAIRED

Members

Beaulieu	Gill
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)	
Plamondon	
Wilkinson	Zahid — 6

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): I declare Motion No. 46 carried.

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 1—SECURITY INTELLIGENCE REVIEW COMMITTEE

Hon. Scott Brison (President of the Treasury Board, Lib.) moved:

That Vote 1, in the amount of $4,607,497, under Security Intelligence Review Committee—Program expenditures, in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2019, be concurred in.

[*English*]

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): The question is on Motion No. 47. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): In my opinion the yeas have it.

And five or more members having risen:

● (0400)

(The House divided on the Motion No. 47, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 809)

YEAS

Members

Aldag	Alghabra
Alleslev	Amos
Anandasangaree	Arseneault
Arya	Ayoub
Badawey	Bagnell
Bains	Baylis
Bennett	Blaikie
Blair	Blaney (North Island—Powell River)
Boissonnault	Bossio
Boutin-Sweet	Bratina
Breton	Brison
Casey (Cumberland—Colchester)	Casey (Charlottetown)
Chagger	Champagne
Chen	Choquette
Cuzner	Dabrusin
Damoff	DeCourcey
Dhaliwal	Dhillon
Drouin	Dubourg
Duguid	Duvall
Dzerowicz	Easter
Ehsassi	Eyking
Fillmore	Fortier
Fragiskatos	Fraser (West Nova)
Fraser (Central Nova)	Fry
Fuhr	Garneau
Gerretsen	Goldsmith-Jones
Goodale	Graham
Hajdu	Harvey
Hébert	Hehr
Hogg	Holland
Housefather	Hutchings
Iacono	Joly
Jones	Kwan
Lambropoulos	Lametti
Lamoureux	Lapointe
Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation)	Leslie
Lightbound	Long
Longfield	Ludwig
MacGregor	MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Malcolmson	Maloney
Masse (Windsor West)	May (Cambridge)
McCrimmon	McGuinty
McKay	McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
McLeod (Northwest Territories)	Mendès
Mendicino	Mihychuk
Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île-des-Sœurs)	
Nault	
Ng	Oliphant
Oliver	O'Regan
Ouellette	Paradis
Peschisolido	Petitpas Taylor
Philpott	Qualtrough
Ramsey	Rioux
Rogers	Romanado
Rudd	Sajjan
Sansoucy	Scarpaleggia
Schiefke	Schulte
Serre	Sgro
Shanahan	Sheehan
Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)	Sidhu (Brampton South)
Sikand	Simms

Sohi
Spengemann
Tan
Trudel
Vandenbeld
Yip 131

Sorbara
Tabbara
Tassi
Vandal
Whalen

NAYS

Members

Aboultaif
Albrecht
Anderson
Barsalou-Duval
Boudrias
Cooper
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Gennis
Hoback
Kent
Kmiec
Lobb
McCauley (Edmonton West)
Motz
Nuttall
Reid
Richards
Schmale
Ste-Marie
Stubbs
Van Loan
Webber

Albas
Allison
Barlow
Benzen
Brassard
Eglinski
Fortin
Harder
Jeneroux
Kitchen
Lake
Marcil
McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)
Nater
Poilievre
Rempel
Saroya
Sorenson
Strahl
Thériault
Waugh
Yurdiga 44

PAIRED

Members

Beaulieu—Gill
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)—Plamondon
Wilkinson—Zahid 6

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): I declare Motion No. 47 adopted.

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 1—ROYAL CANADIAN MOUNTED POLICE EXTERNAL REVIEW COMMITTEE

Hon. Scott Brison (President of the Treasury Board, Lib.) moved:

That Vote 1, in the amount of $2,872,348, under Royal Canadian Mounted Police External Review Committee—Program expenditures, in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2019, be concurred in.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): The question is on Motion No. 48. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): In my opinion the yeas have it.

And five or more members having risen:

● (0405)

[*Translation*]

(The House divided on Motion No. 48, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 809)

YEAS

Members

Aldag
Alleslev
Anandasangaree
Arya
Badawey
Bains
Bennett
Blair
Boissonnault
Boutin-Sweet
Breton
Casey (Cumberland—Colchester)
Chagger
Chen
Cuzner
Damoff
Dhaliwal
Drouin
Duguid
Dzerowicz
Ehsassi
Fillmore
Fragiskatos
Fraser (Central Nova)
Fuhr
Gerretsen
Goodale
Hajdu
Hébert
Hogg
Housefather
Iacono
Jones
Lambropoulos
Lamoureux
Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation)
Lightbound
Longfield
MacGregor
Malcolmson
Massé (Windsor West)
McCrimmon
McKay
McLeod (Northwest Territories)
Mendicino
Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île-des-Sœurs)
Nault
Ng
Oliver
Ouellette
Peschisolido
Philpott
Ramsey
Rogers
Rudd
Sansoucy
Schiefke
Serré
Shanahan
Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)
Sikand
Sohi
Spengemann
Tan
Trudel
Vandenbeld
Yip 131

Alghabra
Amos
Arseneault
Ayoub
Bagnell
Baylis
Blaikie
Blaney (North Island—Powell River)
Bossio
Bratina
Brison
Casey (Charlottetown)
Champagne
Choquette
Dabrusin
DeCourcey
Dhillon
Dubourg
Duvall
Easter
Eyking
Fortier
Fraser (West Nova)
Fry
Garneau
Goldsmith-Jones
Graham
Harvey
Hehr
Holland
Hutchings
Joly
Kwan
Lametti
Lapointe
Leslie
Long
Ludwig
MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Maloney
May (Cambridge)
McGuinty
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
Mendès
Mihychuk

Oliphant
O'Regan
Paradis
Petitpas Taylor
Qualtrough
Rioux
Romanado
Sajjan
Scarpaleggia
Schulte
Sgro
Sheehan
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Simms
Sorbara
Tabbara
Tassi
Vandal
Whalen

NAYS

Members

Aboultaif	Albas
Albrecht	Allison
Anderson	Barlow
Barsalou-Duval	Benzen
Boudrias	Brassard
Cooper	Eglinski
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)	Fortin
Genuis	Harder
Hoback	Jeneroux
Kent	Kitchen
Kmiec	Lake
Lobb	Marcil
McCauley (Edmonton West)	McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)
Motz	Nater
Nuttall	Poilievre
Reid	Rempel
Richards	Saroya
Schmale	Sorenson
Ste-Marie	Strahl
Stubbs	Theriault
Van Loan	Waugh
Webber	Yurdiga — 44

PAIRED

Members

Beaulieu	Gill
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)—Plamondon	
Wilkinson	Zahid — 6

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): I declare Motion No. 48 carried.

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 1—MILITARY GRIEVANCES EXTERNAL REVIEW COMMITTEE

Hon. Scott Brison (President of the Treasury Board, Lib.) moved:

That Vote 1, in the amount of $6,150,062, under Military Grievances External Review Committee—Program expenditures, in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2019, be concurred in.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): The question is on Motion No. 49. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): In my opinion the yeas have it.

And five or more members having risen:

● (0410)

(The House divided on Motion No. 49, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 810)

YEAS

Members

Aldag	Alghabra
Allesley	Amos
Anandasangaree	Arseneault
Arya	Ayoub
Badawey	Bagnell
Bains	Baylis
Bennett	Blaikie
Blair	Blaney (North Island—Powell River)
Boissonnault	Bossio
Boulerice	Boutin-Sweet
Bratina	Breton
Brison	Casey (Cumberland—Colchester)
Casey (Charlottetown)	Chagger
Champagne	Chen
Choquette	Cuzner
Dabrusin	Damoff
DeCourcey	Dhaliwal
Dhillon	Drouin
Dubourg	Duguid
Duvall	Dzerowicz
Easter	Ehsassi
Eyking	Fillmore
Fortier	Fragiskatos
Fraser (West Nova)	Fraser (Central Nova)
Fry	Fuhr
Garneau	Goldsmith-Jones
Graham	Grewal
Hajdu	Harvey
Hébert	Hehr
Hogg	Housefather
Hutchings	Iacono
Joly	Jones
Kwan	Lambropoulos
Lametti	Lamoureux
Lapointe	Lanzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation)
Leslie	Levitt
Lightbound	Long
Longfield	Ludwig
MacGregor	MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Malcolmson	Maloney
Masse (Windsor West)	May (Cambridge)
McCrimmon	McGuinty
McKay	McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
McLeod (Northwest Territories)	Mendès
Mendicino	Mihychuk
Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île-des-Sœurs)	
Nault	
Ng	Oliphant
Oliver	O'Regan
Ouellette	Paradis
Peschisolido	Petitpas Taylor
Philpott	Qualtrough
Ramsey	Rioux
Robillard	Rogers
Romanado	Rudd
Sajjan	Samson
Sansoucy	Scarpaleggia
Schiefke	Schulte
Sgro	Shanahan
Sheehan	Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)
Sidhu (Brampton South)	Sikand
Simms	Sohi
Sorbara	Tabbara
Tan	Tassi
Trudel	Vandal
Vandenbeld	Whalen
Yip — 131	

NAYS

Members

Aboultaif	Albas
Albrecht	Allison
Barlow	Barsalou-Duval
Benzen	Boudrias
Brassard	Cooper
Eglinski	Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)

Fortin	Genuis
Harder	Hoback
Jeneroux	Kent
Kitchen	Kmiec
Lake	Lobb
Marcil	McCauley (Edmonton West)
McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)	Motz
Nater	Nuttall
Poilievre	Reid
Rempel	Richards
Saroya	Schmale
Ste-Marie	Strahl
Stubbs	Thériault
Van Loan	Waugh
Webber	Yurdiga — 42

PAIRED

Members

Beaulieu	Gill
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)	
Plamondon	
Wilkinson	Zahid — 6

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): I declare Motion No. 49 carried.

[*English*]

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 1—OFFICE OF THE PUBLIC SECTOR INTEGRITY COMMISSIONER

Hon. Scott Brison (President of the Treasury Board, Lib.) moved:

That Vote 1, in the amount of $5,009,887, under Office of the Public Sector Integrity Commissioner—Program expenditures and contributions, in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2019, be concurred in.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): The question is on Motion No. 50. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): In my opinion the yeas have it.

And five or more members having risen:

● (0415)

[*Translation*]

(The House divided on Motion No. 50, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 811)

YEAS

Members

Aldag	Alghabra
Allesley	Amos
Anandasangaree	Arseneault
Arya	Ayoub
Badawey	Bagnell
Bains	Baylis
Bennett	Blaikie
Blair	Blaney (North Island—Powell River)
Boissonnault	Bossio
Boulerice	Boutin-Sweet
Bratina	Breton
Brison	Casey (Cumberland—Colchester)
Casey (Charlottetown)	Chagger
Champagne	Chen
Choquette	Cuzner
Dabrusin	Damoff
DeCourcey	Dhaliwal
Dhillon	Drouin
Dubourg	Duguid
Duvall	Dzerowicz
Easter	Ehsassi
El-Khoury	Eyking
Fillmore	Fortier
Fortin	Fragiskatos
Fraser (West Nova)	Fraser (Central Nova)
Fry	Fuhr
Garneau	Goldsmith-Jones
Goodale	Graham
Grewal	Hajdu
Harvey	Hébert
Hehr	Hogg
Holland	Housefather
Hutchings	Iacono
Joly	Jones
Kwan	Lambropoulos
Lametti	Lamoureux
Lapointe	Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation)
Leslie	Levitt
Lightbound	Long
Longfield	Ludwig
MacGregor	MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Malcolmson	Maloney
Masse (Windsor West)	May (Cambridge)
McCrimmon	McGuinty
McKay	McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
McLeod (Northwest Territories)	Mendès
Mendicino	Mihychuk
Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île-des-Sœurs)	
Nault	
Ng	Oliphant
Oliver	O'Regan
Ouellette	Paradis
Peschisolido	Petitpas Taylor
Philpott	Qualtrough
Ramsey	Rioux
Robillard	Rogers
Romanado	Rudd
Sajjan	Samson
Sansoucy	Schiefke
Schulte	Sgro
Shanahan	Sheehan
Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)	Sidhu (Brampton South)
Sikand	Simms
Sohi	Sorbara
Spengemann	Ste-Marie
Tabbara	Tan
Tassi	Thériault
Trudel	Vandal
Vandenbeld	Whalen
Yip — 137	

NAYS

Members

Aboultaif	Albas
Albrecht	Anderson
Barlow	Barsalou-Duval
Benzen	Boudrias
Brassard	Cooper
Eglinski	Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Genuis	Harder
Hoback	Jeneroux
Kitchen	Lake
Lobb	Marcil
McCauley (Edmonton West)	McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)
Motz	Nater

Nuttall	Poilievre
Reid	Rempel
Richards	Saroya
Schmale	Strahl
Stubbs	Van Loan
Waugh	Webber
Yurdiga 37	

PAIRED

Members

Beaulieu	Gill
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)—Plamondon	
Wilkinson	Zahid 6

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): I declare Motion No. 50 carried.

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 1—OFFICE OF THE COMMISSIONER OF LOBBYING

Hon. Scott Brison (President of the Treasury Board, Lib.) moved:

That Vote 1, in the amount of $4,086,292, under Office of the Commissioner of Lobbying—Program expenditures, in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2019, be concurred in.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): The question is on Motion No. 51. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mrs. Carol Hughes): In my opinion the yeas have it.

And five or more members having risen, the House proceeded to the vote.

Before the Clerk announced the results of the vote:

● (0425)

Mr. Rhéal Fortin: Mr. Speaker, we want to vote in favour of the motion, but our votes were not recorded.

Could you record our votes in favour of the motion, please?

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): Does the hon. member have the consent of the House?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

(The House divided on Motion No. 51, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 812)

YEAS

Members

Aldag	Alghabra
Allesley	Amos
Anandasangaree	Arseneault
Arya	Ayoub
Badawey	Bagnell
Bains	Baylis
Bennett	Blaikie
Blair	Blaney (North Island—Powell River)
Boissonnault	Bossio
Boulerice	Boutin-Sweet
Bratina	Breton
Brison	Casey (Cumberland—Colchester)
Casey (Charlottetown)	Chagger
Champagne	Chen
Choquette	Cuzner
Dabrusin	Damoff
DeCourcey	Dhaliwal
Dhillon	Drouin
Dubourg	Duguid
Dzerowicz	Easter
Ehsassi	El-Khoury
Eyking	Fillmore
Fortier	Fortin
Fragiskatos	Fraser (West Nova)
Fraser (Central Nova)	Fry
Fuhr	Garneau
Gerretsen	Goldsmith-Jones
Goodale	Graham
Grewal	Hajdu
Harvey	Hébert
Hehr	Hogg
Holland	Housefather
Hutchings	Iacono
Joly	Jones
Kwan	Lambropoulos
Lametti	Lamoureux
Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation)	Leslie
Levitt	Lightbound
Long	Longfield
Ludwig	MacGregor
MacKinnon (Gatineau)	Malcolmson
Maloney	Masse (Windsor West)
May (Cambridge)	McCrimmon
McKay	McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
McLeod (Northwest Territories)	Mendès
Mendicino	Mihychuk
Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île-des-Sœurs)	
Nault	
Ng	Oliphant
Oliver	O'Regan
Ouellette	Paradis
Peschisolido	Petitpas Taylor
Philpott	Qualtrough
Ramsey	Rioux
Robillard	Rogers
Romanado	Rudd
Sajjan	Samson
Sangha	Sansoucy
Scarpaleggia	Schiefke
Schulte	Sgro
Shanahan	Sheehan
Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)	Sidhu (Brampton South)
Sikand	Simms
Sohi	Sorbara
Spengemann	Ste-Marie
Tabbara	Tan
Tassi	Thériault
Trudel	Vandal
Vandenbeld	Whalen
Yip 137	

NAYS

Members

Aboultaif	Albas
Albrecht	Allison
Anderson	Barlow

Barsalou-Duval
Boudrias
Cooper
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Harder
Jeneroux
Lake
McCauley (Edmonton West)
Motz
Nuttall
Poilievre
Rempel
Saroya
Strahl
Van Loan
Waugh
Yurdiga — 39

Benzen
Brassard
Eglinski
Genuis
Hoback
Kitchen
Marcil
McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)
Nater
Paul-Hus
Reid
Richards
Schmale
Stubbs
Wagantall
Webber

PAIRED

Members

Beaulieu — Gill
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia) — Plamondon
Wilkinson — Zahid — 6

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): I declare Motion No. 51 carried.

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 1—OFFICE OF THE COMMISSIONER OF OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

Hon. Scott Brison (President of the Treasury Board, Lib.) moved:

That Vote 1, in the amount of $19,101,205, under Office of the Commissioner of Official Languages—Program expenditures, in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2019, be concurred in.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): The question is on Motion No. 52. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): In my opinion the yeas have it.

And five or more members having risen:

● (0430)

[*English*]

(The House divided on Motion No. 52, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 813)

YEAS

Members

Aldag
Alghabra
Alleslev
Anandasangaree
Arya
Badawey
Bains
Bennett
Blair
Boissonnault
Boulerice
Bratina
Brison
Casey (Cumberland—Colchester)
Chagger
Chen
Cuzner
Damoff
Dhaliwal
Drouin
Duguid
Easter
El-Khoury
Eyolfson
Fortier
Fragiskatos
Fraser (Central Nova)
Fuhr
Gerretsen
Goodale
Grewal
Harvey
Hehr
Holland
Hutchings
Johns
Jones
Lambropoulos
Lamoureux
Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation)
Levitt
Long
Ludwig
MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Maloney
May (Cambridge)
McGuinty
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
Mendès
Mihychuk
Nault
Oliphant
O'Regan
Paradis
Petitpas Taylor
Qualtrough
Rioux
Rogers
Rudd
Samson
Sansoucy
Schulte
Shanahan
Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)
Sikand
Sohi
Ste-Marie
Tan
Trudel
Vandenbeld
Yip — 139

Amos
Arseneault
Ayoub
Bagnell
Baylis
Blaikie
Blaney (North Island—Powell River)
Bossio
Boutin-Sweet
Breton
Caesar-Chavannes
Casey (Charlottetown)
Champagne
Choquette
Dabrusin
DeCourcey
Dhillon
Dubourg
Dzerowicz
Ehsassi
Eyking
Fillmore
Fortin
Fraser (West Nova)
Fry
Garneau
Goldsmith-Jones
Graham
Hajdu
Hébert
Hogg
Housefather
Iacono
Joly
Kwan
Lametti
Lapointe
Leslie
Lightbound
Longfield
MacGregor
Malcolmson
Masse (Windsor West)
McCrimmon
McKay
McLeod (Northwest Territories)
Mendicino
Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île-des-Soeurs)
Ng
Oliver
Ouellette
Peschisolido
Philpott
Ramsey
Robillard
Romanado
Sajjan
Sangha
Scarpaleggia
Sgro
Sheehan
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Simms
Spengemann
Tabbara
Thériault
Vandal
Whalen

NAYS

Members

Aboultaif
Albrecht
Anderson
Barsalou-Duval
Boudrias
Cooper
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Harder
Kent

Albas
Allison
Barlow
Benzen
Brassard
Eglinski
Genuis
Jeneroux
Kitchen

Lake
McCauley (Edmonton West)
Motz
Nuttall
Poilievre
Rempel
Schmale
Van Loan
Waugh
Yurdiga 37

Marcil
McLeod (Kamloops Thompson Cariboo)
Nater
Paul-Hus
Reid
Saroya
Stubbs
Wagantall
Webber

PAIRED

Members

Beaulieu Gill
Massé (Avignon La Mitis Matane Matapédia)
Plamondon
Wilkinson Zahid 6

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): I declare Motion No. 52 carried.

[Translation]

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 1—OFFICES OF THE INFORMATION AND PRIVACY COMMISSIONERS OF CANADA

Hon. Scott Brison (President of the Treasury Board, Lib.) moved:

That Vote 1, in the amount of $10,127,084, under Offices of the Information and Privacy Commissioners of Canada—Office of the Information Commissioner of Canada–Program expenditures, in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2019, be concurred in.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): The next question is on Motion No. 53. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota) All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): In my opinion the yeas have it.

And five or more members having risen:

● (0435)

The House divided on Motion No. 53, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 814)

YEAS

Members

Aldag
Allesley
Anandasangaree
Arya
Badawey
Baylis
Blaikie
Boissonnault
Boulerice

Alghabra
Amos
Arseneault
Ayoub
Bagnell
Bibeau
Blaney (North Island Powell River)
Bossio
Boutin-Sweet

Bratina
Brison
Casey (Charlottetown)
Champagne
Choquette
Damoff
Dhillon
Duclos
Dzerowicz
El Khoury
Fergus
Fisher
Fortier
Fry
Goldsmith-Jones
Harvey
Hehr
Holland
Hutchings
Johns
Kwan
Lamoureux
Lauzon (Argenteuil La Petite-Nation)
Leslie
Lightbound
Long
Ludwig
MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Maloney
May (Cambridge)
McGuinty
McKenna
McLeod (Northwest Territories)
Miller (Ville-Marie Le Sud-Ouest Île-des-Sœurs)
Nault
Ng
O'Regan
Paradis
Picard
Qualtrough
Rioux
Rogers
Rudd
Sahota
Sajjan
Sangha
Sarai
Schiefke
Sohi
Spengemann
Tabbara
Thériault
Vandal
Vaughan
Wilson-Raybould
Yip

Breton
Caesar-Chavannes
Chagger
Chen
Dabrusin
DeCourcey
Drouin
Duguid
Ehsassi
Eyolfson
Fillmore
Fonseca
Fortin
Garneau
Goodale
Hébert
Hogg
Housefather
Iacono
Joly
Lambropoulos
Lapointe
Lebouthillier
Levitt
Lockhart
Longfield
MacGregor
Malcolmson
Masse (Windsor West)
McCrimmon
McKay
McKinnon (Coquitlam Port Coquitlam)
Mendicino
Oliver
Ouellette
Petitpas Taylor
Poissant
Ramsey
Robillard
Romanado
Ruimy
Saini
Samson
Sansoucy
Scarpaleggia
Simms
Sorbara
Ste-Marie
Tan
Trudel
Vandenbeld
Whalen
Wrzesnewskyj
Young 128

NAYS

Members

Aboultaif
Albrecht
Anderson
Barsalou-Duval
Boudrias
Cooper
Falk (Battlefords Lloydminster)
Gourde
Jeneroux
Kitchen
Lobb
McCauley (Edmonton West)
Nuttall
Poilievre
Rempel
Saroya
Stubbs
Wagantall

Albas
Allison
Barlow
Benzen
Brassard
Eglinski
Genuis
Harder
Kent
Lake
Marcil
McLeod (Kamloops Thompson Cariboo)
Paul-Hus
Reid
Richards
Schmale
Van Loan
Yurdiga 36

PAIRED

Members

Beaulieu	Gill
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)	
Plamondon	
Wilkinson	Zahid — 6

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): I declare Motion No. 53 carried.

[English]

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 5—OFFICES OF THE INFORMATION AND PRIVACY COMMISSIONERS OF CANADA

Hon. Scott Brison (President of the Treasury Board, Lib.) moved:

That Vote 5, in the amount of $22,693,992, under Offices of the Information and Privacy Commissioners of Canada—Office of the Privacy Commissioner of Canada—Program expenditures and contributions, in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2019, be concurred in.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): The question is on Motion No. 54. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): In my opinion the yeas have it.

And five or more members having risen:

● (0440)

(The House divided on Motion No. 54, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 815)

YEAS

Members

Alghabra	Amos
Anandasangaree	Arseneault
Arya	Ayoub
Badawey	Bagnell
Baylis	Bibeau
Blaikie	Blaney (North Island—Powell River)
Boissonnault	Bossio
Boulerice	Boutin-Sweet
Bratina	Brison
Caesar-Chavannes	Casey (Charlottetown)
Chagger	Champagne
Chen	Choquette
Dabrusin	Damoff
DeCourcey	Dhillon
Drouin	Duclos
Duguid	Duvall
Dzerowicz	Easter
Ehsassi	El Khoury
Ellis	Eyolfson
Fergus	Fillmore
Fisher	Fonseca
Fortier	Fortin
Fry	Garneau
Goldsmith-Jones	Goodale
Gould	Harvey
Hébert	Hehr
Hogg	Holland
Housefather	Hutchings
Iacono	Johns
Khera	Kwan
Lambropoulos	Lamoureux
Lapointe	Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation)
Lebouthillier	Leslie
Levitt	Lightbound
Lockhart	Long
Longfield	Ludwig
MacGregor	Malcolmson
Maloney	Masse (Windsor West)
May (Cambridge)	McCrimmon
McGuinty	McKenna
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)	McLeod (Northwest Territories)
Mendicino	Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île-des-Sœurs)
Murray	Nault
Ng	Oliver
O'Regan	Ouellette
Paradis	Picard
Poissant	Qualtrough
Ramsey	Rioux
Robillard	Rogers
Romanado	Rudd
Ruimy	Sahota
Saini	Sajjan
Samson	Sangha
Sansoucy	Sarai
Scarpaleggia	Schiefke
Simms	Sohi
Sorbara	Spengemann
Ste-Marie	Tan
Thériault	Trudel
Vandal	Vandenbeld
Vaughan	Whalen
Wilson-Raybould	Wrzesnewskyj
Yip	Young — 126

NAYS

Members

Aboultaif	Albas
Albrecht	Allison
Anderson	Barlow
Barsalou-Duval	Benzen
Boudrias	Brassard
Cooper	Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Fast	Genuis
Gourde	Harder
Jeneroux	Kent
Kitchen	Kmiec
Lake	Lobb
Marcil	McCauley (Edmonton West)
McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)	Nater
Paul-Hus	Poilievre
Reid	Rempel
Richards	Saroya
Schmale	Strahl
Stubbs	Van Loan
Wagantall	Yurdiga — 38

PAIRED

Members

Beaulieu	Gill
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)	
Plamondon	
Wilkinson	Zahid — 6

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): I declare Motion No. 54 carried.

[*Translation*]

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 1—CANADIAN NUCLEAR SAFETY COMMISSION

Hon. Scott Brison (President of the Treasury Board, Lib.) moved:

That Vote 1, in the amount of $38,176,811, under Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission—Program expenditures, grants and contributions, in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2019, be concurred in.

● (0445)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): The question is on Motion No. 55. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): In my opinion the yeas have it.

And five or more members having risen:

● (0450)

The House divided on Motion No. 55, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 816)

YEAS

Members

Alghabra	Amos
Anandasangaree	Arseneault
Arya	Ayoub
Badawey	Bagnell
Baylis	Bibeau
Blaikie	Blair
Blaney (North Island—Powell River)	Boissonnault
Bossio	Boulerice
Boutin-Sweet	Bratina
Brison	Caesar-Chavannes
Casey (Charlottetown)	Chagger
Champagne	Chen
Choquette	Dabrusin
Damoff	DeCourcey
Dhillon	Drouin
Duclos	Dugud
Duvall	Dzerowicz
Easter	Ehsassi
El-Khoury	Ellis
Eyolfson	Fergus
Fillmore	Fisher
Fonseca	Fortier
Fry	Garneau
Goldsmith-Jones	Goodale
Gould	Harvey
Hébert	Hehr
Hogg	Holland
Housefather	Hutchings
Iacono	Johns
Joly	Khera
Kwan	Lambropoulos
Lamoureux	Lapointe
Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation)	Lebouthillier
Leslie	Levitt
Lightbound	Lockhart
Long	Longfield
Ludwig	MacGregor
MacKinnon (Gatineau)	Malcolmson
Maloney	Masse (Windsor West)
May (Cambridge)	McCrimmon
McGuinty	McKay
McKenna	McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
McLeod (Northwest Territories)	Mendicino
Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île-des-Sœurs)	
Murray	
Nault	Ng
O'Connell	Oliver
O'Regan	Ouellette
Paradis	Picard
Poissant	Qualtrough
Ramsey	Rioux
Robillard	Rogers
Romanado	Rudd
Rumny	Sahota
Saini	Sajjan
Samson	Sangha
Sansoucy	Sarai
Scarpaleggia	Schiefke
Simms	Sohi
Sorbara	Spengemann
Tan	Tassi
Trudel	Vandal
Vandenbeld	Vaughan
Whalen	Wilson-Raybould
Wrzesnewskyj	Yip
Young — 129	

NAYS

Members

Aboultaif	Albas
Albrecht	Allison
Anderson	Barlow
Barsalou-Duval	Benzen
Boudrias	Brassard
Cooper	Eglinski
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)	Fast
Fortin	Genuis
Gourde	Harder
Jeneroux	Kent
Kitchen	Kmiec
Lake	Lobb
Marcil	McCauley (Edmonton West)
McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)	Nater
O'Toole	Paul-Hus
Poilievre	Reid
Rempel	Richards
Saroya	Schmale
Ste-Marie	Strahl
Stubbs	Thériault
Van Loan	Viersen
Waugantall	Yurdiga — 44

PAIRED

Members

Beaulieu	Gill
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)	
Plamondon	
Wilkinson	Zahid — 6

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): I declare Motion No. 55 carried.

[*English*]

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 1—CANADIAN HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION

Hon. Scott Brison (President of the Treasury Board, Lib.) moved:

That Vote 1, in the amount of $19,854,487, under Canadian Human Rights Commission—Program expenditures, in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2019, be concurred in.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): The question is on Motion No. 56. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): In my opinion the nays have it.

And five or more members having risen:

● (0455)

(The House divided on Motion No. 56, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 817)

YEAS

Members

Alghabra	Amos
Anandasangaree	Arseneault
Arya	Ayoub
Badawey	Bagnell
Baylis	Bibeau
Blaikie	Blair
Blaney (North Island—Powell River)	Boissonnault
Bossio	Boulerice
Boutin-Sweet	Breton
Brison	Caesar-Chavannes
Casey (Charlottetown)	Chagger
Champagne	Chen
Choquette	Cormier
Dabrusin	Damoff
DeCourcey	Dhillon
Drouin	Duclos
Duguid	Duvall
Dzerowicz	Easter
Ehsassi	El Khoury
Ellis	Eyolfson
Fergus	Fillmore
Fisher	Fonseca
Fortier	Fry
Garneau	Goldsmith-Jones
Goodale	Gould
Harvey	Hébert
Hehr	Hogg
Holland	Housefather
Hutchings	Iacono
Johns	Joly
Khera	Lambropoulos
Lamoureux	Lapointe
Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite Nation)	Lebouthillier
Levitt	Lightbound
Lockhart	Long
Longfield	Ludwig
MacGregor	MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Malcolmson	Maloney
Masse (Windsor West)	May (Cambridge)
McCrimmon	McGuinty
McKay	McKenna
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)	McLeod (Northwest Territories)
Mendicino	Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île-des-Sœurs)
Murray	Nault
Ng	O'Connell
Oliver	O'Regan
Ouellette	Paradis
Peterson	Petitpas Taylor
Picard	Ponsant
Qualtrough	Ramsey
Rioux	Robillard
Rogers	Romanado
Rudd	Rumy
Sahota	Saini
Sajjan	Samson
Sangha	Samsoucy
Sarai	Scarpaleggia
Schiefke	Simms
Sohi	Sorbara
Spengemann	Tabbara
Tassi	Trudel
Vandal	Vandenbeld
Vaughan	Whalen
Wilson-Raybould	Wrzesnewskyj
Yip	Young — 130

NAYS

Members

Aboultaif	Albas
Albrecht	Allison
Anderson	Barlow
Barsalou-Duval	Benzen
Boudrias	Brassard
Cooper	Eglinski
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)	Fast
Fortin	Gourde
Genuis	Harder
Jeneroux	Kent
Kitchen	Kmiec
Lake	Lobb
Marcil	McCauley (Edmonton West)
McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)	O'Toole
Paul-Hus	Poilievre
Reid	Rempel
Richards	Saroya
Schmale	Ste-Marie
Strahl	Stubbs
Thériault	Van Loan
Viersen	Wagantall
Yurdiga — 43	

PAIRED

Members

Beaulieu	Gill
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)—Plamondon	
Wilkinson	Zahid — 6

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): I declare Motion No. 56 carried.

[*Translation*]

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 1—CANADIAN GRAIN COMMISSION

Hon. Scott Brison (President of the Treasury Board, Lib.) moved:

That Vote 1, in the amount of $4,846,955, under Canadian Grain Commission—Program expenditures, in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2019, be concurred in.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): The question is on Motion No. 57. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): In my opinion the yeas have it.

And five or more members having risen:

● (0500)

[*English*]

(The House divided on Motion No. 57, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 818)

YEAS

Members

Aghabra	Amos
Anandasangaree	Arseneault
Ayoub	Badawey
Bagnell	Bibeau
Blaikie	Blair
Blaney (North Island—Powell River)	Boissonnault
Bossio	Boulerice
Boudrias	Breton
Brison	Caesar-Chavannes
Casey (Charlottetown)	Chagger
Champagne	Chen
Choquette	Cormier
Dabrusin	Damoff
DeCourcey	Dhaliwal
Drouin	Duclos
Duguid	Duvall
Dzerowicz	Easter
Ehsassi	Ellis
Eyolfson	Fergus
Fillmore	Fisher
Fonseca	Fortier
Fry	Garneau
Goldsmith-Jones	Goodale
Gould	Harvey
Hébert	Hehr
Hogg	Holland
Housefather	Hutchings
Iacono	Johns
Joly	Khera
Lambropoulos	Lamoureux
Lapointe	Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation)
Lebouthillier	Levitt
Lightbound	Lockhart
Long	Longfield
Ludwig	MacGregor
MacKinnon (Gatineau)	Malcolmson
Maloney	Masse (Windsor West)
May (Cambridge)	McCrimmon
McGuinty	McKay
McKenna	McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
McLeod (Northwest Territories)	Mendicino
Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île-des-Soeurs)	
Murray	
Nault	Ng
O'Connell	Oliver
O'Regan	Ouellette
Paradis	Peterson
Petitpas Taylor	Picard
Poissant	Qualtrough
Ramsey	Robillard
Rogers	Romanado
Rudd	Rusnak
Sahota	Saini
Samson	Sangha
Sansoucy	Scarpaleggia
Schuetke	Simms
Sohi	Sorbara
Spengemann	Tabbara
Tan	Tassi
Trudel	Vandal
Vandenbeld	Vaughan
Whalen	Wilson-Raybould
Wrzesnewskyj	Yip
Young — 125	

NAYS

Members

Albrecht	Allison
Anderson	Barlow
Barsalou-Duval	Benzen
Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis)	Brassard
Cooper	Eglinski
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)	Fast
Fortin	Genuis
Gourde	Harder
Kent	Kitchen
Lake	Lobb
McCauley (Edmonton West)	McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)
O'Toole	Poilievre
Reid	Rempel
Richards	Saroya
Schmale	Ste-Marie
Strahl	Stubbs
Thériault	Van Loan
Viersen	Waugh
Yurdiga — 37	

PAIRED

Members

Beaulieu	Gill
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)	
Plamondon	
Wilkinson	Zahid — 6

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): I declare Motion No. 57 carried.

● (0505)

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 1—CANADIAN DAIRY COMMISSION

Hon. Scott Brison (President of the Treasury Board, Lib.) moved:

That Vote 1, in the amount of $3,755,068, under Canadian Dairy Commission—Program expenditures, in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2019, be concurred in.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): The question is on Motion No. 58. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): In my opinion the yeas have it.

And five or more members having risen:

(The House divided on Motion No. 58, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 819)

YEAS

Members

Alghabra	Amos
Anandasangaree	Arseneault
Ayoub	Badawey
Bagnell	Bibeau
Blaikie	Blair
Blaney (North Island—Powell River)	Boissonnault
Bossio	Boulerice
Boutin-Sweet	Bratina
Breton	Brison
Caesar-Chavannes	Casey (Charlottetown)
Chagger	Champagne
Chen	Choquette
Cormier	Dabrusin
Damoff	DeCourcey
Dhillon	Ducks
Duguid	Dzerowicz
Easter	Ehsassi
Ellis	Eyolfson
Fergus	Fillmore
Fisher	Fonseca
Fortier	Fry
Garneau	Goldsmith-Jones
Goodale	Gould
Harvey	Hébert
Hogg	Holland
Housefather	Hutchings
Iacono	Johns
Joly	Khera
Kwan	Landry-Boudos
Lamoureux	Lapointe
Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation)	Lebouthillier
Levitt	Lockhart
Long	Longfield
Ludwig	MacGregor
MacKinnon (Gatineau)	Maloney
Massé (Windsor West)	May (Cambridge)
McCrimmon	McGuinty
McKay	McKenna
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)	McLeod (Northwest Territories)
Mendicino	Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île-des-Sœurs)
Murray	Ng
O'Connell	Oliver
O'Regan	Ouellette
Paradis	Peterson
Pettipas Taylor	Picard
Poissant	Qualtrough
Rioux	Robillard
Rogers	Rudd
Rumiy	Sahota
Saini	Samson
Sangha	Sansoucy
Scarpaleggia	Schiefke
Simms	Sohi
Sorbara	Spengemann
Tan	Tassi
Vandal	Vandenbeld
Vaughan	Whalen
Wilson-Raybould	Wrzesnewsky
Yip	Young—118

NAYS

Members

Albrecht	Anderson
Barlow	Barsalou-Duval
Benzen	Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis)
Brassard	Cooper
Eglinski	Fast
Fortin	Gemmis
Gourde	Harder
Kitchen	Lake
McCauley (Edmonton West)	McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)
O'Toole	Poilievre
Reid	Rempel
Richards	Saroya
Schmale	Ste-Marie
Strahl	Stubbs
Eberuldt	Van Loan
Viersen	Wagantall
Yurdiga—33	

PAIRED

Members

Beaulieu	Gill
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)	
Plamondon	
Wilkinson	Zahid—6

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): I declare Motion No. 58 carried.

[*Translation*]

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 1—CANADIAN TOURISM COMMISSION

Hon. Scott Brison (President of the Treasury Board, Lib.) moved:

That Vote 1, in the amount of $95,655,544, under Canadian Tourism Commission—Payments to the Canadian Tourism Commission, in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2019, be concurred in.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): The next question is on Motion No. 59. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): In my opinion the yeas have it.

And five or more members having risen:

● (0810)

(The House divided on Motion No. 59, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 820)

YEAS

Members

Alghabra	Anandasangaree
Arya	Ayoub
Badawey	Bagnell
Bibeau	Blaikie
Blair	Blaney (North Island—Powell River)
Boissonnault	Bossio
Boulerice	Boutin-Sweet
Bratina	Breton
Brison	Caesar-Chavannes
Casey (Charlottetown)	Chagger
Champagne	Chen
Choquette	Cormier
Dabrusin	Damoff
DeCourcey	Dhillon

Duclos	Duguid
Dzerowicz	Easter
Ellis	Eyolfson
Fergus	Fillmore
Fisher	Fonseca
Fortier	Fry
Garneau	Goldsmith-Jones
Gould	Hébert
Holland	Hutchings
Iacono	Johns
Joly	Khera
Kwan	Lambropoulos
Lamoureux	Lapointe
Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation)	Lebouthillier
Leslie	Levitt
Lockhart	Long
Longfield	Ludwig
MacGregor	MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Maloney	Massé (Windsor West)
May (Cambridge)	McCrimmon
McGuinty	McKay
McKenna	McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
McLeod (Northwest Territories)	Mendicino
Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île-des-Sœurs)	
Murray	
Ng	O'Connell
Oliver	O'Regan
Ouellette	Paradis
Peterson	Petitpas Taylor
Picard	Poissant
Qualtrough	Rankin
Rioux	Rogers
Rudd	Ruimy
Saboia	Saini
Samson	Sangha
Sansoucy	Scarpaleggia
Schiefke	Simms
Sohi	Sorbara
Spengemann	Tan
Tassi	Vandal
Vandenbeld	Vaughan
Whalen	Wilson-Raybould
Wrzesnewskyj	Yip
Young — 117	

NAYS

Members

Albrecht	Anderson
Barlow	Benson
Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis)	Brassard
Cooper	Eglinski
Fast	Fortin
Genuis	Gourde
Harder	Kitchen
Lake	McCauley (Edmonton West)
McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)	O'Toole
Poilievre	Reid
Rempel	Richards
Saroya	Schmale
Ste-Marie	Strahl
Stubbs	Thériault
Van Loan	Viersen
Wagantall	Yurdiga — 32

PAIRED

Members

Beaulieu	Gill
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)	
Plamondon	
Wilkinson	Zahid — 6

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): I declare Motion No. 59 carried.

● (0515)

[English]

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 1—CIVILIAN REVIEW AND COMPLAINTS COMMISSION FOR THE ROYAL CANADIAN MOUNTED POLICE

Hon. Scott Brison (President of the Treasury Board, Lib.) moved:

That Vote 1, in the amount of $9,667,981, under Civilian Review and Complaints Commission for the Royal Canadian Mounted Police — Program expenditures, in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2019, be concurred in.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): The question is on Motion No. 60. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

And five or more members having risen:

(The House divided on Motion No. 60, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 821)

YEAS

Members

Alghabra	Amos
Ananthasangaree	Arseneault
Arya	Ayoub
Badawey	Bagnell
Baylis	Bibeau
Blaikie	Blair
Blaney (North Island—Powell River)	Boissonnault
Bossio	Boutin-Sweet
Bratina	Breton
Brison	Caesar-Chavannes
Casey (Charlottetown)	Chagger
Champagne	Chen
Choquette	Cormier
Dabrusin	Damoff
DeCourcey	Dhillon
Drouin	Duclos
Duguid	Dzerowicz
Easter	Ellis
Eyolfson	Fergus
Fillmore	Fisher
Fonseca	Fortier
Fry	Garneau
Goldsmith-Jones	Gould
Harvey	Hébert
Hogg	Holland
Housefather	Hutchings
Iacono	Johns
Joly	Khera
Kwan	Lambropoulos
Lamoureux	Lapointe
Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation)	Lebouthillier
Leslie	Levitt
Lightbound	Lockhart
Long	Longfield
Ludwig	MacGregor
MacKinnon (Gatineau)	Maloney

Masse (Windsor West)
McCrimmon
McKay
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
Mendicino
Soeurs)
Murray
O'Connell
Ouellette
Peterson
Picard
Rioux
Rogers
Rudd
Sahota
Samson
Scarpaleggia
Simms
Sorbara
Tan
Vandal
Vaughan
Wrzesnewskyj
Young — 117

May (Cambridge)
McGuinty
McKenna
McLeod (Northwest Territories)
Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île-des-
Ng
O'Regan
Paradis
Petitpas Taylor
Poissant
Robillard
Romanado
Ruimy
Saini
Sansoucy
Schiefke
Sohi
Spengemann
Tassi
Vandenbeld
Wilson-Raybould
Yip

NAYS

Members

Albrecht
Barlow
Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis)
Eglinski
Genuis
Harder
Lake
McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)
Reid
Saroya
Strahl
Van Loan
Yurdiga — 25

Anderson
Benzen
Cooper
Fast
Gourde
Kitchen
McCauley (Edmonton West)
Poilievre
Richards
Schmale
Stubbs
Wagantall

PAIRED

Members

Beaulieu — Gill
Masse (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)—Plamondon
Wilkinson — Zahid — 6

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): I declare Motion No. 60 carried.

● (0520)

[*Translation*]

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 1—MILITARY POLICE COMPLAINTS COMMISSION

Hon. Scott Brison (President of the Treasury Board, Lib.) moved:

That Vote 1, in the amount of $4,288,506, under Military Police Complaints Commission—Program expenditures, in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2019, be concurred in.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): The question is on Motion No. 61. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): In my opinion the yeas have it.

And five or more members having risen:

● (0525)

The House divided on Motion No. 61, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 822)

YEAS

Members

Alghabra
Anandasangaree
Arya
Badawey
Baylis
Blaikie
Blaney (North Island—Powell River)
Bossio
Bratina
Brison
Casey (Charlottetown)
Champagne
Choquette
Dabrusin
DeCourcey
Drouin
Duguid
Easter
Eyolfson
Fisher
Fortier
Garneau
Gould
Hébert
Holland
Hutchings
Johns
Khera
Lambropoulos
Lapointe
Lebouthillier
Levitt
Lockhart
Longfield
MacGregor
Malcolmson
Masse (Windsor West)
McCrimmon
McKay
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
Mendicino
Soeurs)
Murray
Ng
Oliver
Ouellette
Peterson
Picard
Ramsey
Robillard
Romanado
Ruimy
Saini
Sangha
Sarai
Schiefke
Sohi
Spengemann
Tassi
Vandenbeld
Wilson-Raybould

Amos
Arseneault
Ayoub
Bagnell
Bibeau
Blair
Boissonnault
Boutin-Sweet
Breton
Caesar-Chavannes
Chagger
Chen
Cormier
Damoff
Dhillon
Duclos
Drouin
Ellis
Fergus
Fonseca
Fry
Goldsmith-Jones
Harvey
Hogg
Housefather
Iacono
Joly
Kwan
Lamoureux
Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation)
Leslie
Lightbound
Long
Ludwig
MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Maloney
May (Cambridge)
McGuinty
McKenna
McLeod (Northwest Territories)
Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île-des-
Nault
O'Connell
O'Regan
Paradis
Petitpas Taylor
Poissant
Rioux
Rogers
Rudd
Sahota
Samson
Sansoucy
Scarpaleggia
Simms
Sorbara
Tan
Vandal
Vaughan
Wrzesnewskyj

Yip Young 122

NAYS

Members

Albas Albrecht
Anderson Barlow
Benzen Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Levis)
Cooper Eglinski
Fast Fortin
Genuis Gourde
Kitchen Lake
McCauley (Edmonton West) Saroya
Schmale Ste-Marie
Strahl Stubbs
Van Loan Wagantall
Yurdiga 23

PAIRED

Members

Beaulieu Gill
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)
Plamondon
Wilkinson Zahid 6

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): I declare Motion No. 61 carried.

[English]

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 1—IMMIGRATION AND REFUGEE BOARD

Hon. Scott Brison (President of the Treasury Board, Lib.) moved:

That Vote 1, in the amount of $118,949,994, under Immigration and Refugee Board—Program expenditures, in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2019, be concurred in.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): The question is on Motion No. 62. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): In my opinion the yeas have it.

And five or more members having risen:

● (0530)

(The House divided on Motion No. 62, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 823)

YEAS

Members

Alghabra Amos
Anandasangaree Arseneault
Arya Ayoub
Badawey Bagnell
Baylis Bibeau
Blaikie Blair
Boissonnault Bossio
Boulerice Boutin-Sweet
Bratina Breton
Brison Caesar-Chavannes
Casey (Charlottetown) Chagger
Champagne Choquette
Cormier Dabrusin
Damoff DeCourcey
Dhillon Drouin
Duclos Duguid
Duvall Easter
Ehsassi El-Khoury
Ellis Eyolfson
Fergus Fisher
Fonseca Fortier
Fry Goldsmith-Jones
Goodale Gould
Harvey Hébert
Hogg Holland
Housefather Hutchings
Johns Joly
Kwan Lambropoulos
Lametti Lamoureux
Lapointe Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation)
Lebouthillier Leslie
Levitt Lightbound
Lockhart Long
Longfield Ludwig
MacGregor MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Malcolmson Maloney
Masse (Windsor West) May (Cambridge)
McCrimmon McGuinty
McKay McKenna
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam) McLeod (Northwest Territories)
Mendicino Murray
Nault Ng
Oliver O'Regan
Ouellette Paradis
Peterson Petitpas Taylor
Picard Poissant
Qualtrough Ramsey
Rioux Robillard
Rogers Romanado
Rudd Rumy
Sahota Saini
Samson Sangha
Sansoucy Sarai
Scarpaleggia Schiefke
Sgro Simms
Sohi Sorbara
Spengemann Tan
Tassi Vandal
Vandenbeld Vaughan
Whalen Wilson-Raybould
Wrzesnewskyj Yip
Young 123

NAYS

Members

Albas Albrecht
Anderson Barlow
Barsalou-Duval Benzen
Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Levis) Boudrias
Cooper Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Fast Fortin
Genuis Gourde
Kitchen Lake
Marcil McCauley (Edmonton West)
Saroya Strahl
Stubbs Van Loan
Wagantall 23

PAIRED

Members

Beaulieu Gill
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)
Plamondon

Wilkinson — Zahid — 6

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): I declare Motion No. 62 carried.

[*Translation*]

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 1—NATIONAL CAPITAL COMMISSION

Hon. Scott Brison (President of the Treasury Board, Lib.) moved:

That Vote 1, in the amount of $66,146,361, under National Capital Commission —Payments to the National Capital Commission for operating expenditures, in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2019, be concurred in.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): The question is on Motion No. 63. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): In my opinion the nays have it.

And five or more members having risen:

● (0535)

(The House divided on Motion No. 63, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 824)

YEAS

Members

Aldag — Alghabra
Alleslev — Arseneault
Arya — Badawey
Bagnell — Baylis
Bennett — Bibeau
Blaikie — Blair
Boissonnault — Bossio
Boulerice — Boutin-Sweet
Bratina — Breton
Brison — Caesar-Chavannes
Casey (Cumberland—Colchester) — Casey (Charlottetown)
Champagne — Choquette
Cormier — Dabrusin
Damoff — DeCourcey
Dhillon — Drouin
Dubourg — Duclos
Duguid — Duvall
Easter — Ehsassi
El-Khoury — Ellis
Erskine-Smith — Eyking
Evolfson — Fergus
Fillmore — Fisher
Fonseca — Fortin
Fragiskatos — Fraser (West Nova)
Fraser (Central Nova) — Garneau
Goldsmith-Jones — Goodale
Gould — Graham
Hajdu — Holland
Johns — Joly
Kwan — Lametti
Lamoureux — Lapointe
Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation) — Lebouthillier
Leslie — Levitt
Lightbound — Lockhart
Long — Longfield
Ludwig — MacGregor
MacKinnon (Gatineau) — Malcolmson
Maloney — Masse (Windsor West)
May (Cambridge) — McCrimmon
McKenna — McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
McLeod (Northwest Territories) — Mendès
Mendicino — Mihychuk
Murray — Nault
Oliphant — Oliver
O'Regan — Ouellette
Paurie — Peschisolido
Petitpas Taylor — Philpott
Picard — Poissant
Qualtrough — Ramsey
Rioux — Robillard
Rodriguez — Romanado
Rudd — Rumny
Sahota — Saini
Samson — Sangha
Sansoucy — Sarai
Schiefke — Schulte
Sgro — Shanahan
Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon) — Sidhu (Brampton South)
Simms — Sohi
Ste-Marie — Tassi
Vaughan — Whalen
Wilson-Raybould — Wrzesnewskyj
Young — 125

NAYS

Members

Albas — Albrecht
Anderson — Barlow
Barsalou-Duval — Benzen
Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis) — Boudrias
Brassard — Cooper
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster) — Fast
Gerrus — Kelly
Kitchen — Lake
Marcil — McCauley (Edmonton West)
Saroya — Strahl
Stubbs — Van Loan
Wagantall — 23

PAIRED

Members

Beaulieu — Gill
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia) —
Plamondon —
Wilkinson — Zahid — 6

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): I declare Motion No. 63 carried.

[*English*]

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 5—NATIONAL CAPITAL COMMISSION

Hon. Scott Brison (President of the Treasury Board, Lib.) moved:

Que le crédit 5, au montant de 29 041 524 $, sous la rubrique Commission de la capitale nationale — Paiements à la Commission de la capitale nationale pour les dépenses en capital, du Budget principal des dépenses pour l'exercice se terminant le 31 mars 2019, soit agréé.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): The question is on Motion No. 64. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): In my opinion the yeas have it.

And five or more members having risen:

● (0540)

(The House divided on Motion No. 64, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 825)

YEAS

Members

Aldag	Alghabra
Allesley	Arseneault
Arya	Badawey
Bagnell	Baylis
Bennett	Bibeau
Blair	Boissonnault
Boulerice	Boutin-Sweet
Bratina	Breton
Brison	Caesar-Chavannes
Casey (Cumberland—Colchester)	Casey (Charlottetown)
Champagne	Choquette
Cormier	Csumer
Dabrusin	Damoff
DeCourcey	Dhillon
Drouin	Dubourg
Duclos	Duguid
Duvall	Dzerowicz
Ehsassi	El-Khoury
Ellis	Erskine-Smith
Eyking	Eyolfson
Fergus	Fillmore
Fisher	Fonseca
Fragiskatos	Fraser (West Nova)
Fraser (Central Nova)	Garneau
Gerretsen	Goldsmith-Jones
Goodale	Gould
Graham	Grewal
Hajdu	Holland
Iacono	Joly
Jones	Khera
Kwan	Lametti
Lamoureux	Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation)
Lebouthillier	Leslie
Levitt	Lightbound
Lockhart	Long
Longfield	Ludwig
MacKinnon (Gatineau)	Malcolmson
Maloney	Masse (Windsor West)
May (Cambridge)	McCrimmon
McKenna	McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
McLeod (Northwest Territories)	Mendès
Mendicino	Mihychuk
Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île des Sœurs)	
Murray	
Nault	O'Connell
Oliphant	Oliver
O'Regan	Ouellette
Peschisolido	Petitpas Taylor
Philpott	Picard
Poissant	Qualtrough
Ramsey	Rioux
Robillard	Rodriguez
Romanado	Rudd
Rumny	Sahota
Saini	Samson
Sangha	Sansoucy
Sarai	Schiefke
Schulte	Serre
Sgro	Shanahan
Sheehan	Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)
Sidhu (Brampton South)	Simms
Sohi	Tassi
Vaughan	Whalen
Wilson-Raybould	Wrzesnewskyj
Young—127	

NAYS

Members

Albas	Albrecht
Anderson	Barlow
Barsalou-Duval	Benzen
Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis)	Boudrias
Brassard	Cooper
Eglinski	Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Fast	Fortin
Genuis	Kelly
Kitchen	Lake
Liepert	Marcil
McCauley (Edmonton West)	McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)
Pauzé	Richards
Saroya	Ste-Marie
Stubbs	Van Loan
Wagantall	Yurdiga—30

PAIRED

Members

Beaulieu	Gill
Masse (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)	
Plamondon	
Wilkinson	Zahid—6

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): I declare Motion No. 64 carried.

[*Translation*]

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 1—PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

Hon. Scott Brison (President of the Treasury Board, Lib.) moved:

That Vote 1, in the amount of $74,360,701, under Public Service Commission—Program expenditures, in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2019, be concurred in.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): The question is on Motion No. 65. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): In my opinion the yeas have it.

And five or more members having risen:

● (0545)

(The House divided on Motion No. 65, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 826)

YEAS

Members

Aldag	Alghabra
Alleslev	Arseneault
Arya	Badawey
Bagnell	Baylis
Bennett	Bibeau
Blair	Boissonnault
Bossio	Boulerice
Boutin-Sweet	Bratina
Breton	Brison
Caesar-Chavannes	Casey (Cumberland—Colchester)
Casey (Charlottetown)	Champagne
Choquette	Cormier
Csmer	Dabrusin
DeCourcey	Dhillon
Drouin	Dubourg
Duclos	Duguid
Duvall	Dzerowicz
Ehsassi	El Khoury
Ellis	Erskine-Smith
Eyking	Eyolfson
Fergus	Fillmore
Fisher	Fonseca
Fragiskatos	Fraser (West Nova)
Fraser (Central Nova)	Fuhr
Gameau	Gerretsen
Goldsmith-Jones	Goodale
Graham	Grewal
Hajdu	Holland
Iacono	Joly
Jones	Khera
Kwan	Lametti
Lamoureux	Lapointe
Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation)	Leslie
Levitt	Lightbound
Lockhart	Long
Longfield	Ludwig
MacKinnon (Gatineau)	Malcolmson
Maloney	Masse (Windsor West)
May (Cambridge)	McCrimmon
McKenna	McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
McLeod (Northwest Territories)	Mendès
Mendicino	Mihychuk
Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île-des-Sœurs)	
Murray	
Nault	O'Connell
Oliphant	Oliver
O'Regan	Peschisolido
Petitpas Taylor	Philpott
Picard	Poissant
Qualtrough	Ramsey
Rioux	Robillard
Rodriguez	Romanado
Rudd	Ruimy
Sahota	Saini
Samson	Sangha
Sansoucy	Sarai
Schiefke	Schulte
Serré	Shanahan
Sheehan	Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)
Sidhu (Brampton South)	Simms
Sohi	Tassi
Vaughan	Whalen
Wilson-Raybould	Wrzesnewskyj
Young — 125	

NAYS

Members

Aboultaif	Albas
Albrecht	Anderson
Barlow	Barsalou-Duval
Benzen	Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis)
Boudrias	Brassard
Cooper	Eglinski
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)	Fast
Genuis	Jeneroux
Kelly	Kitchen
Lake	Liepert
Marcil	McCauley (Edmonton West)
McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)	Paul-Hus
Pauze	Reid
Richards	Saroya
Schmale	Shields
Ste-Marie	Stubbs
Van Loan	Wagantall
Yurdiga — 35	

PAIRED

Members

Beaulieu	Gill
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)	
Plamondon	
Wilkinson	Zahid — 6

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): I declare Motion No. 65 carried.

● (0550)

[*English*]

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 1—THE NATIONAL BATTLEFIELDS COMMISSION

Hon. Scott Brison (President of the Treasury Board, Lib.) moved:

That Vote 1, in the amount of $7,470,199, under The National Battlefields Commission—Program expenditures, in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2019, be concurred in.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): The question is on Motion No. 66. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): In my opinion the yeas have it.

And five or more members having risen:

● (0555)

(The House divided on Motion No. 66, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 827)

YEAS

Members

Aldag	Alghabra
Alleslev	Arseneault
Arya	Badawey
Bagnell	Bains
Baylis	Bennett

Bibeau	Blair
Boissonnault	Bossio
Boulerice	Boutin-Sweet
Bratina	Breton
Brison	Caesar-Chavannes
Casey (Cumberland—Colchester)	Casey (Charlottetown)
Champagne	Choquette
Cormier	Cuzner
Dabrusin	DeCourcey
Dhillon	Drouin
Dubourg	Duclos
Duguid	Duvall
Dzerowicz	Ehsassi
El-Khoury	Ellis
Erskine-Smith	Eyking
Eyolfson	Fergus
Fillmore	Fisher
Fonseca	Fragiskatos
Fraser (West Nova)	Fraser (Central Nova)
Fuhr	Garneau
Gerretsen	Goldsmith-Jones
Goodale	Graham
Grewal	Hajdu
Holland	Iacono
Joly	Jones
Khera	Kwan
Lametti	Lamoureux
Lapointe	Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation)
Lebouthillier	Leslie
Levitt	Lightbound
Lockhart	Long
Longfield	Ludwig
MacKinnon (Gatineau)	Malcolmson
Masse (Windsor West)	May (Cambridge)
McCrimmon	McKenna
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)	McLeod (Northwest Territories)
Mendès	Mendicino
Mihychuk	Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île-des-Soeurs)
Murray	Nault
O'Connell	Oliphant
Oliver	O'Regan
Peschisolido	Peterson
Petitpas Taylor	Philpott
Picard	Poissant
Qualtrough	Ramsey
Raoux	Robillard
Rodriguez	Romanado
Rudd	Ruimy
Sahota	Saini
Samson	Sangha
Sarai	Schulte
Serré	Shanahan
Sheehan	Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)
Sidhu (Brampton South)	Simms
Sohi	Tassi
Vaughan	Whalen
Wilson-Raybould	Young — 124

NAYS

Members

Aboultaif	Albas
Albrecht	Anderson
Barlow	Barsalou-Duval
Benzen	Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis)
Boudrias	Brassard
Cooper	Eglinski
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)	Fast
Genuis	Gourde
Jeneroux	Kelly
Kitchen	Lake
Liepert	Marcil
McCauley (Edmonton West)	McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)
Paul-Hus	Pauzé
Poilievre	Reid
Richards	Saroya
Schmale	Shields
Ste-Marie	Stubbs
Van Loan	Viersen
Wagantall	Yurdiga — 38

PAIRED

Members

Beaulieu	Gill
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)	
Plamondon	
Wilkinson	Zahid — 6

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): I declared Motion No. 66 carried.

[*Translation*]

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 1—PAROLE BOARD OF CANADA

Hon. Scott Brison (President of the Treasury Board, Lib.) moved:

That Vote 1, in the amount of $42,457,608, under Parole Board of Canada—Program expenditures, in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2019, be concurred in.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): The next question is on Motion No. 67. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): In my opinion the yeas have it.

And five or more members having risen:

● (0600)

(The House divided on Motion No. 67, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 828)

YEAS

Members

Aldag	Alghabra
Alleslev	Arseneault
Arya	Badawey
Bagnell	Bains
Baylis	Bennett
Bibeau	Blair
Boissonnault	Bossio
Boulerice	Boutin-Sweet
Bratina	Breton
Brison	Brosseau
Caesar-Chavannes	Casey (Cumberland—Colchester)
Casey (Charlottetown)	Champagne
Choquette	Cormier
Cuzner	Dabrusin
Damoff	DeCourcey
Dhillon	Drouin
Dubourg	Duclos
Duguid	Duvall
Dzerowicz	Ehsassi
El-Khoury	Erskine-Smith
Eyking	Eyolfson
Fergus	Fillmore

Fisher
Fragiskatos
Fraser (Central Nova)
Garneau
Goldsmith-Jones
Graham
Hajdu
Iacono
Jones
Kwan
Lamoureux
Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation)
Leslie
Lightbound
Long
Ludwig
Malcolmson
Masse (Windsor West)
McCrimmon
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
Mendès
Mihychuk
Moore
Murray
O'Connell
Oliver
Peschisolido
Petitpas Taylor
Poissant
Ramsey
Robillard
Romanado
Ruimy
Saini
Sangha
Schiefke
Serré
Sheehan
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Sohi
Trudel
Whalen
Wrzesnewsky)

Fonseca
Fraser (West Nova)
Fuhr
Gerretsen
Goodale
Grewal
Holland
Joly
Khera
Lametti
Lapointe
Lebouthillier
Levitt
Lockhart
Longfield
MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Maloney
May (Cambridge)
McKenna
McLeod (Northwest Territories)
Mendicino
Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île-des-Sœurs)
Nault
Oliphant
O'Regan
Peterson
Philpott
Qualtrough
Rioux
Rodriguez
Rudd
Sahota
Samson
Sarai
Schulte
Shanahan
Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)
Simms
Tassi
Vaughan
Wilson-Raybould
Young — 128

NAYS

Members

Aboultaif
Albrecht
Barlow
Benzen
Boudrias
Cooper
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Genuis
Kelly
Lake
Marcil
McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)
Poilievre
Richards
Schmale
Ste-Marie
Van Loan
Yurdiga — 35

Albas
Anderson
Barsalou-Duval
Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis)
Brassard
Eglinski
Fast
Gourde
Kitchen
Liepert
McCauley (Edmonton West)
Pauzé
Reid
Saroya
Shields
Stubbs
Viersen

PAIRED

Members

Beaulieu — Gill
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)—Plamondon
Wilkinson — Zahid — 6

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): I declare Motion No. 67 carried.

Business of Supply

[*English*]

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 1—COPYRIGHT BOARD

Hon. Scott Brison (President of the Treasury Board, Lib.) moved:

That Vote 1, in the amount of $3,022,473, under Copyright Board—Program expenditures, in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2019, be concurred in.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): The question is on Motion No. 68. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): In my opinion the yeas have it.

And five or more members having risen:

● (0605)

(The House divided on Motion No. 68, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 829)

YEAS

Members

Aldag
Alleslev
Arya
Badawey
Bains
Bennett
Bibeau
Boissonnault
Boulerice
Bratina
Brosseau
Casey (Cumberland—Colchester)
Champagne
Cuzner
DeCourcey
Drouin
Duclos
Duvall
Ehsassi
Erskine-Smith
Eyolfson
Fillmore
Fonseca
Fraser (West Nova)
Fuhr
Gerretsen
Goodale
Graham
Hajdu
Hutchings
Johns
Jones
Kwan
Lamoureux

Alghabra
Arseneault
Ayoub
Bagnell
Baylis
Benson
Blair
Bossio
Boutin-Sweet
Brison
Caesar-Chavannes
Casey (Charlottetown)
Commer
Damoff
Dhillon
Dubourg
Duguid
Dzerowicz
El-Khoury
Eyking
Fergus
Fisher
Fragiskatos
Fraser (Central Nova)
Garneau
Goldsmith-Jones
Gould
Grewal
Holland
Iacono
Joly
Khera
Lametti
Lapointe

Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation)	Laverdière
Lebouthillier	Leslie
Levitt	Lightbound
Lockhart	Long
Longfield	Ludwig
MacGregor	MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Malcolmson	Maloney
Masse (Windsor West)	McCrimmon
McKenna	McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
Mendès	Mendicino
Mihychuk	Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île-des-Sœurs)
Murray	Nault
O'Connell	Oliphant
Oliver	O'Regan
Ouellette	Peschisolido
Peterson	Petitpas Taylor
Philpott	Picard
Poissant	Qualtrough
Ramsey	Rioux
Robillard	Rodriguez
Romanado	Rudd
Sahota	Saini
Samson	Sangha
Sansoucy	Sarai
Schiefke	Schulte
Serré	Shanahan
Sheehan	Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)
Sidhu (Brampton South)	Simms
Sohi	Tassi
Trudel	Vaughan
Whalen	Wrzesnewskyj
Young — 131	

NAYS

Members

Aboultaif	Albas
Anderson	Barlow
Barsalou-Duval	Benzen
Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis)	Boudrias
Brassard	Cooper
Eglinski	Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Fast	Genuis
Gourde	Kelly
Lake	Liepert
Marcil	McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)
Pauzé	Poilievre
Reid	Richards
Saroya	Schmale
Shields	Stubbs
Van Loan	Yurdiga — 30

PAIRED

Members

Beaulieu	Gill
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)	
Plamondon	
Wilkinson	Zahid — 6

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): I declare Motion No. 68 carried.

[*Translation*]

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 1—INTERNATIONAL JOINT COMMISSION (CANADIAN SECTION)

Hon. Scott Brison (President of the Treasury Board, Lib.) moved:

That Vote 1, in the amount of $11,267,974, under International Joint Commission (Canadian Section)—Program expenditures, in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2019, be concurred in.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): The question is on Motion No. 69. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): In my opinion the yeas have it.

And five or more members having risen:

● (0610)

(The House divided on Motion No. 69, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 830)

YEAS

Members

Aldag	Alghabra
Alleslev	Arseneault
Arya	Ayoub
Badawey	Bagnell
Bains	Baylis
Bennett	Benson
Bibeau	Blair
Blaney (North Island—Powell River)	Boissonnault
Bossio	Boulerice
Boutin-Sweet	Bratina
Brison	Brosseau
Caesar-Chavannes	Casey (Cumberland—Colchester)
Casey (Charlottetown)	Champagne
Chen	Cormier
Cuzner	Dabrusin
Damoff	DeCourcey
Dhillon	Drouin
Dubourg	Duclos
Duguid	Duvall
Dzerowicz	Ehsassi
El-Khoury	Ellis
Erskine-Smith	Eyking
Eyolfson	Fergus
Fillmore	Fisher
Fonseca	Fragiskatos
Fraser (West Nova)	Fraser (Central Nova)
Fuhr	Garneau
Gerretsen	Goldsmith-Jones
Goodale	Gould
Graham	Grewal
Hajdu	Holland
Hutchings	Iacono
Johns	Joly
Jones	Khera
Kwan	Lametti
Lamoureux	Lapointe
Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation)	Laverdière
Lebouthillier	Leslie
Levitt	Lightbound
Lockhart	Long
Longfield	Ludwig
MacGregor	MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Malcolmson	Maloney
Masse (Windsor West)	May (Cambridge)
McCrimmon	McKenna
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)	Mendès
Mendicino	Mihychuk
Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île-des-Sœurs)	
Murray	
Nault	O'Connell
Oliphant	Oliver
O'Regan	Ouellette

Peschisolido
Petitpas Taylor
Picard
Qualtrough
Rioux
Rodriguez
Rudd
Sahota
Samson
Sansoucy
Schiefke
Serré
Sheehan
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Sohi
Trudel
Whalen
Wrzesnewskyj
Peterson
Philpott
Poissant
Ramsey
Robillard
Romanado
Ruimy
Saini
Sangha
Sarai
Schulte
Shanahan
Sidhu (Mission — Matsqui — Fraser Canyon)
Simms
Tassi
Vaughan
Wilson-Raybould
Young — 138

NAYS

Members

Aboultaif
Barlow
Boudrias
Cooper
Falk (Battlefords — Lloydminster)
Gourde
Lake
Marcil
Pauzé
Reid
Saroya
Shields
Stubbs
Yurdiga — 27
Albas
Benzen
Brassard
Eglinski
Genuis
Kelly
Liepert
McLeod (Kamloops — Thompson — Cariboo)
Poilievre
Richards
Schmale
Strahl
Van Loan

PAIRED

Members

Beaulieu
Massé (Avignon — La Mitis — Matane — Matapédia)
Plamondon
Wilkinson
Gill
Zahid — 6

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): I declare Motion No. 69 carried.

[*English*]

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 1—STANDARDS COUNCIL OF CANADA

Hon. Scott Brison (President of the Treasury Board, Lib.) moved:

That Vote 1, in the amount of $14,943,000, under Standards Council of Canada—Payments to the Standards Council of Canada, in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2019, be concurred in.

● (0615)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): The question is on Motion No. 70. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): In my opinion the yeas have it.

And five or more members having risen:

(The House divided on Motion No. 70, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 831)

YEAS

Members

Aldag
Allesley
Arya
Badawey
Bains
Bennett
Bibeau
Blair
Boissonnault
Boulerice
Bratina
Brison
Caesar-Chavannes
Casey (Charlottetown)
Chen
Cuzner
Damoff
Dhillon
Dubourg
Duguid
Ehsassi
Ellis
Eyking
Fergus
Fonseca
Fraser (West Nova)
Fuhr
Gerretsen
Goodale
Graham
Hajdu
Hutchings
Johns
Jones
Kwan
Lamoureux
Lauzon (Argenteuil — La Petite Nation)
Lebouthillier
Levitt
Lockhart
Longfield
MacGregor
Malcolmson
May (Cambridge)
McKenna
McLeod (Northwest Territories)
Mendicino
Miller (Ville-Marie — Le Sud-Ouest — Île-des-Sœurs)
Murray
Nault
Oliphant
O'Regan
Peschisolido
Petitpas Taylor
Poissant
Ramsey
Robillard
Romanado
Ruimy
Saini
Sangha
Sarai
Schulte
Shanahan
Sidhu (Mission — Matsqui — Fraser Canyon)
Sikand
Sohi
Tassi
Alghabra
Arseneault
Ayoub
Bagnell
Baylis
Benson
Blaikie
Blaney (North Island — Powell River)
Bossio
Boutin-Sweet
Breton
Brosseau
Casey (Cumberland — Colchester)
Champagne
Cormier
Dabrusin
DeCourcey
Drouin
Duclos
Dzerowicz
El-Khoury
Erskine-Smith
Eyolfson
Fillmore
Fragiskatos
Fraser (Central Nova)
Garneau
Goldsmith-Jones
Gould
Grewal
Holland
Iacono
Joly
Khera
Lametti
Lapointe
Laverdière
Leslie
Lightbound
Long
Ludwig
MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Maloney
McCrimmon
McKinnon (Coquitlam — Port Coquitlam)
Mendès
Mihychuk
O'Connell
Oliver
Ouellette
Peterson
Picard
Qualtrough
Rioux
Rodriguez
Rudd
Sahota
Samson
Sansoucy
Schiefke
Serré
Sheehan
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Simms
Spengemann
Trudel

Vaughan — Whalen
Wilson-Raybould — Wrzesnewskyj
Young — 139

NAYS

Members

Aboultaif — Albas
Benzen — Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis)
Boudrias — Cooper
Eglinski — Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Gennis — Gourde
Jeneroux — Kelly
Lake — Liepert
Marcil — McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)
Pauzé — Poilievre
Reid — Richards
Saroya — Shields
Strahl — Stubbs
Van Loan — Yurdiga — 26

PAIRED

Members

Beaulieu — Gill
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)—Plamondon
Wilkinson — Zahid — 6

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): I declare Motion No. 70 carried.

● (0620)

[*Translation*]

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 1—PATENTED MEDICINE PRICES REVIEW BOARD

Hon. Scott Brison (President of the Treasury Board, Lib.) moved:

That Vote 1, in the amount of $13,689,951, under Patented Medicine Prices Review Board—Program expenditures, in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2019, be concurred in.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): The question is on Motion No. 71. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): In my opinion the yeas have it.

And five or more members having risen:

● (0625)

(The House divided on Motion No. 71, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 832)

YEAS

Members

Aldag — Alghabra
Alleslev — Angus
Arseneault — Arya
Ayoub — Badawey
Bagnell — Bains
Baylis — Bennett
Benson — Bibeau
Blaikie — Blair
Blaney (North Island—Powell River) — Boissonnault
Bossio — Boulerice
Boutin-Sweet — Bratina
Breton — Brison
Brosseau — Caesar-Chavannes
Casey (Cumberland—Colchester) — Casey (Charlottetown)
Champagne — Chen
Choquette — Cormier
Cuzner — Dabrusin
Damoff — DeCourcey
Dhillon — Drouin
Dubourg — Duclos
Duguid — Dzerowicz
Ehsassi — El-Khoury
Ellis — Erskine-Smith
Eyking — Eyolfson
Fergus — Fillmore
Fisher — Fonseca
Fragiskatos — Fraser (West Nova)
Fraser (Central Nova) — Fuhr
Garneau — Gerretsen
Goldsmith-Jones — Goodale
Gould — Graham
Grewal — Hajdu
Holland — Hutchings
Iacono — Johns
Joly — Jones
Khera — Kwan
Lametti — Lamoureux
Lapointe — Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation)
Laverdière — Lebouthillier
Leslie — Levitt
Lightbound — Lockhart
Long — Longfield
Ludwig — MacGregor
MacKinnon (Gatineau) — Malcolmson
Maloney — Masse (Windsor West)
May (Cambridge) — McCrimmon
McKenna — McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
McLeod (Northwest Territories) — Mendès
Mendicino — Mihychuk
Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île-des-Sœurs)—Murray
Nantel — Nault
O'Connell — Oliphant
Oliver — O'Regan
Ouellette — Peschisolido
Peterson — Petitpas Taylor
Philpott — Picard
Poissant — Qualtrough
Ramsey — Rioux
Robillard — Rodriguez
Romanado — Rudd
Ruimy — Sahota
Saini — Samson
Sangha — Sansoucy
Sarai — Schiefke
Schulte — Serré
Shanahan — Sheehan
Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon) — Sikand
Simms — Sohi
Spengemann — Tassi
Trudel — Vaughan
Whalen — Wilson-Raybould
Wrzesnewsky) — Young — 144

NAYS

Members

Aboultaif	Albas
Barlow	Benzen
Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis)	Boudrias
Clarke	Cooper
Eglinski	Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Gennis	Gourde
Jeneroux	Kelly
Lake	Liepert
Marcil	McCauley (Edmonton West)
McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)	Paul-Hus
Pauzé	Reid
Rempel	Richards
Saroya	Shields
Strahl	Stubbs
Van Loan	Yurdiga — 30

PAIRED

Members

Beaulieu	Gill
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)	
Plamondon	
Wilkinson	Zahid — 6

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): I declare Motion No. 71 carried.

[*English*]

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 1—CANADIAN RADIO-TELEVISION AND TELECOMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Hon. Scott Brison (President of the Treasury Board, Lib.) moved:

That Vote 1, in the amount of $5,058,598, under Canadian Radio-television and Telecommunications Commission—Program expenditures, in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2019, be concurred in.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): The question is on Motion No. 72. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Mr. Anthony Rota): In my opinion the yeas have it.

And five or more members having risen:

● (0630)

(The House divided on Motion No. 72, which was agreed to on the following division:)

Business of Supply

(Division No. 833)

YEAS

Members

Aldag	Alghabra
Allesley	Angus
Arseneault	Arya
Ayoub	Badawey
Bagnell	Bains
Baylis	Bennett
Benson	Bibeau
Blaikie	Blair
Bossio	Boutin-Sweet
Breton	Brison
Brosseau	Caesar-Chavannes
Casey (Cumberland—Colchester)	Casey (Charlottetown)
Champagne	Chen
Choquette	Cuzner
Dubrusin	Damoff
DeCourcey	Dhaliwal
Drouin	Dubourg
Duclos	Duguid
Dzerowicz	Ehsassi
El-Khoury	Ellis
Erskine-Smith	Eyking
Eyolfson	Fergus
Fillmore	Fisher
Fonseca	Fragiskatos
Fraser (West Nova)	Fraser (Central Nova)
Fuhr	Gameau
Gerretsen	Goldsmith-Jones
Goodale	Gould
Graham	Grewal
Hajdu	Holland
Hutchings	Iacono
Johns	Joly
Jones	Khera
Lametti	Lamoureux
Lapointe	Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation)
Laverdière	Leboutbillier
Leslie	Lightbound
Long	Longfield
MacGregor	Malcolmson
Maloney	Masse (Windsor West)
May (Cambridge)	McCrimmon
McKenna	McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
McLeod (Northwest Territories)	Mendès
Mendicino	Mihychuk
Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île-des-Sœurs)	
Murray	
Nantel	Nault
O'Connell	Oliphant
Oliver	O'Regan
Ouellette	Peschisolido
Peterson	Petitpas Taylor
Philpott	Picard
Poissant	Qualtrough
Rioux	Robillard
Rodriguez	Romanado
Rudd	Ruimy
Sahota	Saini
Samson	Sangha
Sansoucy	Sarai
Schiefke	Schulte
Serré	Shanahan
Sheehan	Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)
Sidhu (Brampton South)	Simms
Sohi	Spengemann
Tassi	Trudel
Vaughan	Whalen
Wilson-Raybould	Wrzesnewsky)
Young — 133	

NAYS

Members

Aboultaif	Albas
Albrecht	Barlow
Benzen	Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis)
Boudrias	Brassard
Clarke	Cooper

Eglinski
Finley
Gourde
Kelly
Lloyd
McCauley (Edmonton West)
Paul-Hus
Reid
Richards
Shields
Stubbs
Yurdiga — 33

Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Gennis
Jeneroux
Lake
Marcil
McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)
Pauzé
Rempel
Saroya
Strahl
Van Loan

PAIRED

Members

Beaulieu — Gill
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)
Plamondon
Wilkinson — Zahid — 6

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 72 carried.

[*Translation*]

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 1—SOCIAL SCIENCES AND HUMANITIES RESEARCH COUNCIL

Hon. Scott Brison (President of the Treasury Board, Lib.) moved:

That Vote 1, in the amount of $26,186,289, under Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council—Operating expenditures, in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2019, be concurred in.

The Speaker: The question is on Motion No. 73. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And five or more members having risen:

● (0635)

[*English*]

(The House divided on Motion No. 73, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 834)

YEAS

Members

Aldag
Alleslev
Anandasangaree
Arya
Badawey
Bains
Bennett
Blair
Breton
Brosseau
Casey (Cumberland—Colchester)
Champagne

Alghabra
Amos
Anjum
Ayoub
Bagnell
Baylis
Benson
Bossio
Brison
Caesar-Chavannes
Casey (Charlottetown)
Chen

Choquette
Dabrusin
DeCourcey
Drouin
Duclos
Dzerowicz
Ehsassi
Ellis
Eyking
Fillmore
Fonseca
Fragiskatos
Fraser (Central Nova)
Garneau
Goldsmith-Jones
Graham
Hajdu
Hogg
Housefather
Johns
Jones
Lametti
Lavergne
Leslie
Lockhart
Ludwig
Malcolmson
Masse (Windsor West)
McCrimmon
McKenna
McLeod (Northwest Territories)
Mendicino
Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île-des-Sœurs)
Murray
Nantel
Ng
Oliphant
O'Regan
Paradis
Peterson
Philpott
Poissant
Robillard
Rudd
Sahota
Samson
Sansoucy
Scarpaleggia
Schulte
Shanahan
Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)
Simms
Sorbara
Tan
Trudel
Vandenbeld
Whalen
Wrzesnewskyj
Young — 139

Cuzner
Dhaliwal
Dhillon
Dubourg
Duguid
Easter
El-Khoury
Erskine-Smith
Eyolfson
Fisher
Fortier
Fraser (West Nova)
Fuhr
Gerretsen
Goodale
Grewal
Hébert
Holland
Hutchings
Joly
Khera
Lamoureux
Lebouthillier
Lightbound
Long
MacGregor
Maloney
May (Cambridge)
McGuinty
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
Mendès
Mihychuk

Nault
O'Connell
Oliver
Ouellette
Peschisolido
Petitpas Taylor
Picard
Ramsey
Rogers
Rumy
Sajjan
Sangha
Sarai
Schiefke
Serré
Sheehan
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Sohi
Spengemann
Tassi
Vandal
Vaughan
Wilson-Raybould
Yip

NAYS

Members

Aboultaif
Albrecht
Benzen
Boudrias
Clarke
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Gennis
Jeneroux
Kitchen
Lloyd
McCauley (Edmonton West)
Paul-Hus
Poilievre
Richards
Shields
Stubbs
Wagantall

Albas
Barlow
Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis)
Brassard
Cooper
Finley
Gourde
Kelly
Lake
Marcil
McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)
Pauzé
Rempel
Saroya
Strahl
Van Loan
Yurdiga — 34

PAIRED

Members

Beaulieu — Gill
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia) — Plamondon
Wilkinson — Zahid — 6

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 73 carried.

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 5—SOCIAL SCIENCES AND HUMANITIES RESEARCH COUNCIL

Hon. Scott Brison (President of the Treasury Board, Lib.) moved:

That Vote 5, in the amount of $756,932,935, under Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council—Grants, in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2019, be concurred in.

The Speaker: The question is on Motion No. 74. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And five or more members having risen:

● (0640)

[*Translation*]

(The House divided on Motion No. 74, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 835)

YEAS

Members

Aldag — Allesley
Amos — Anandasangaree
Angus — Bagnell
Bains — Bennett
Benson — Bibeau
Brison — Brosseau
Caesar-Chavannes — Casey (Cumberland—Colchester)
Champagne — Chagnette
Cuzner — Dhaliwal
Dhillon — Dubourg
Dubourg — Duclos
Dugind — Dzerowicz
Easter — Ellis
Erskine-Smith — Eyking
Eyolfson — Fisher
Fonseca — Fortier
Fragiskatos — Fraser (West Nova)
Fraser (Central Nova) — Fuhr
Garneau — Gerretsen
Graham — Grewal
Hajdu — Hébert
Hogg — Housefather
Hutchings — Johns
Jones — Khera
Lambropoulos — Lametti
Lamoureux — Lavendière
Lebouthillier — Lightbound

Business of Supply

Lockhart — Longfield
MacGregor — MacKinnon (Edmonton)
Masse (Windsor West) — May (Cambridge)
McCrimmon — McGuinty
McKenna — McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
McLeod (Northwest Territories) — Mendès
Mendicino — Mihychuk
Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île-des-Sœurs) — Monsef
Murray — Nantel
Ng — Nault
Oliphant — O'Connell
Ouellette — Oliver
Peschisolido — Paradis
Philpott — Peterson
Poissant — Picard
Rogers — Robillard
Sahota — Romy
Samson — Sangha
Sansoucy — Sarai
Scarpaleggia — Schulte
Serré — Sgro
Shanahan — Sheehan
Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon) — Sidhu (Brampton South)
Sikand — Simms
Sohi — Sorbara
Spengemann — Tan
Tassi — Trudel
Vandal — Vandenbeld
Vaughan — Whalen
Wilson-Raybould — Wrzesnewskyj
Yip — Young — 116

NAYS

Members

Aboultaif — Albas
Albrecht — Barlow
Benzen — Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis)
Brassard — Clarke
Cooper — Eglinski
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster) — Finley
Genuis — Gourde
Jeneroux — Kelly
Kitchen — Lake
Liepert — Lloyd
Marcil — McCauley (Edmonton West)
McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo) — Paul-Hus
Pazzo — Poilievre
Richards — Saroya
Shields — Stubbs
Van Loan — Wagantall
Yurdiga — 33

PAIRED

Members

Beaulieu — Gill
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia) — Plamondon
Wilkinson — Zahid — 6

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 74 carried.

● (0645)

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 1—NATURAL SCIENCES AND ENGINEERING RESEARCH COUNCIL

Hon. Scott Brison (President of the Treasury Board, Lib.) moved:

That Vote 1, in the amount of $46,122,469, under Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council—Operating expenditures, in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2019, be concurred in.

The Speaker: The question is on Motion No. 75. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And five or more members having risen:

● (0650)

(The House divided on Motion No. 75, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 836)

YEAS

Members

Aldag	Alleslev
Amos	Anandasangaree
Angus	Ashfield
Bains	Bennett
Benson	Bibeau
Binson	Bossscau
Caesar Chavannes	Casey (Cumberland—Colchester)
Champagne	Chagnette
Cuzner	Dhaliwal
Dhillon	Drouin
Dubourg	Ducks
Duguid	Easter
Ellis	Erskine Smith
Eyking	Eyolfson
Fergus	Fisher
Fonseca	Fortier
Fragiskatos	Fraser (West Nova)
Fraser (Central Nova)	Fuhr
Garneau	Genueben
Graham	Hardy
Harvey	Hebert
Hogg	Householder
Hutchings	Johns
Jones	Khera
Lambropoulos	Lametti
Lamoureux	Lavendière
Lebouthillier	Lightbound
Lockhart	Longfield
MacGregor	MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Massé (Windsor West)	McCrimmon
McGuinty	McKay
McKenna	McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
McLeod (Northwest Territories)	Mendès
Mendicino	Mihychuk
Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île des Sœurs)	
Murray	
Nantel	Nault
Ng	O'Connell
Oliphant	Oliver
Ouellette	Paradis
Peschisolido	Peterson
Philpott	Picard
Poissant	Robillard
Rodriguez	Rogers
Rumy	Sahota
Saini	Samson
Sangha	Sarmocy
Sauvé	Scarpaleggia
Schulte	Serré
Sgro	Shanahan
Sheehan	Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)
Sidhu (Brampton South)	Sikand
Simms	Sohi
Sorbara	Spengemann
Tan	Trudel
Vandal	Vandenbeld
Vaughan	Whalen
Wilson-Raybould	Wrzesnewskyj
Yip — 115	

NAYS

Members

Aboultaif	Albas
Albrecht	Barlow
Benzen	Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis)
Brassard	Clarke
Cooper	Diotte
Eglinski	Finley
Gemmis	Gourde
Jeneroux	Kelly
Kitchen	Kusie
Lake	Lloyd
Marcil	McCauley (Edmonton West)
McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)	Paul-Hus
Pauzé	Poilievre
Richards	Saroya
Shields	Strahl
Stubbs	Van Loan
Wagantall	Yurdiga — 34

PAIRED

Members

Beaulieu	Gill
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)	
Plamondon	
Wilkinson	Zahid — 6

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 75 carried.

[*English*]

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 5—NATURAL SCIENCES AND ENGINEERING RESEARCH COUNCIL

Hon. Scott Brison (President of the Treasury Board, Lib.) moved:

That Vote 5, in the amount of $1,202,907,659, under Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council—Grants, in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2019, be concurred in.

The Speaker: The question is on Motion No. 76. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And five or more members having risen:

● (0655)

(The House divided on Motion No. 76, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 837)

YEAS

Members

Aldag	Allesley
Amos	Anandasangaree
Angus	Bagnell
Bains	Bennett
Benson	Bibeau
Bratina	Brison
Brosseau	Caesar-Chavannes
Casey (Cumberland—Colchester)	Choquette
Cuzner	Dhaliwal
Dhillon	Drouin
Dubourg	Duclos
Duguid	Dzerowicz
Easter	Ellis
Erskine-Smith	Eyking
Eyolfson	Fergus
Fisher	Fonseca
Fortier	Fragiskatos
Fraser (West Nova)	Fraser (Central Nova)
Fuhr	Garneau
Graham	Hajdu
Harvey	Hébert
Hogg	Housefather
Hutchings	Johns
Jones	Khera
Lambropoulos	Lametti
Lamoureux	Lavendière
Lebouthillier	Lightbound
Lockhart	Longfield
MacGregor	MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Masse (Windsor West)	McCrimmon
McGuinty	McKay
McKenna	McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
McLeod (Northwest Territories)	Mendès
Mendicino	Mihychuk
Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île-des-Soeurs)	
Murray	
Nantel	Nault
Ng	O'Connell
Oliphant	Oliver
Ouellette	Paradis
Peschisolido	Peterson
Philpott	Picard
Poissant	Robillard
Rodriguez	Rogers
Rumny	Sahota
Saini	Samson
Sangha	Sansoucy
Sarai	Scarpaleggia
Schulte	Serré
Sgro	Shanahan
Sheehan	Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)
Sidhu (Brampton South)	Sikand
Sohi	Sorbara
Spengemann	Tan
Tassi	Trudel
Vandal	Vandenbeld
Vaughan	Whalen
Wilson-Raybould	Wrzesnewskyj
Yip — 115	

NAYS

Members

Aboultaif	Albas
Albrecht	Barlow
Benzen	Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis)
Boudrias	Brassard
Clarke	Cooper
Diotte	Eglinski
Finley	Gennis
Gourde	Jeneroux
Kelly	Kitchen
Kusie	Lake
Lloyd	Marcil
McCauley (Edmonton West)	McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)
Paul-Hus	Pauzé
Poilievre	Rempel
Richards	Saroya
Shields	Strahl
Stubbs	Van Loan
Wagantall	Yurdiga — 36

PAIRED

Members

Beaulieu	Gill
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)	
Plamondon	
Wilkinson	Zahid — 6

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 76 carried.

[*Translation*]

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 1—CANADA COUNCIL FOR THE ARTS

Hon. Scott Brison (President of the Treasury Board, Lib.) moved:

That Vote 1, in the amount of $292,632,337, under Canada Council for the Arts—Payments to the Canada Council for the Arts, in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2019, be concurred in.

The Speaker: The question is on Motion No. 77. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And five or more members having risen:

● (0700)

(The House divided on Motion No. 77, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 838)

YEAS

Members

Aldag	Allesley
Amos	Anandasangaree
Angus	Bagnell
Bains	Bennett
Benson	Bibeau
Bratina	Brison
Brosseau	Caesar-Chavannes
Casey (Cumberland—Colchester)	Choquette
Cormier	Cuzner
Dhaliwal	Dhillon
Drouin	Dubourg
Duclos	Duguid
Easter	El-Khoury
Ellis	Erskine-Smith
Eyking	Eyolfson
Fergus	Fisher
Fonseca	Fortier
Fragiskatos	Fraser (West Nova)
Fraser (Central Nova)	Fuhr
Garneau	Graham
Hajdu	Harvey
Hébert	Hogg
Housefather	Hutchings

Johns	Jones
Khera	Lambropoulos
Lametti	Lamoureux
Laverdière	Lebouthillier
Lightbound	Lockhart
Longfield	MacGregor
MacKinnon (Gatineau)	Masse (Windsor West)
McCrimmon	McGuinty
McKay	McKenna
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)	McLeod (Northwest Territories)
Mendès	Mendicino
Mihychuk	Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île-des-Soeurs)
Murray	Nantel
Nault	Ng
O'Connell	Oliphant
Oliver	Ouellette
Paradis	Peschisolido
Peterson	Philpott
Picard	Poissant
Robillard	Rodriguez
Rogers	Ruimy
Sahota	Saini
Samson	Sangha
Sansoucy	Sarai
Scarpaleggia	Schulte
Serré	Sgro
Shanahan	Sheehan
Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)	Sidhu (Brampton South)
Sikand	Sorbara
Spengemann	Tan
Tassi	Trudel
Vandal	Vandenbeld
Vaughan	Whalen
Wilson-Raybould	Wrzesnewskyj
Yip	Young — 116

NAYS

Members

Aboultaif	Albas
Albrecht	Barlow
Benzen	Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis)
Boudrias	Brassard
Clarke	Cooper
Diotte	Eglinski
Finley	Genuis
Gourde	Jeneroux
Kelly	Kitchen
Kusie	Lake
Leitch	Liepert
Lloyd	Marcil
McCauley (Edmonton West)	McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)
Nater	Paul-Hus
Pauzé	Poilievre
Rempel	Richards
Saroya	Shields
Strahl	Stubbs
Van Loan	Wagantall
Yurdiga — 39	

PAIRED

Members

Beaulieu	Gill
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)	
Plamondon	
Wilkinson	Zahid — 6

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 77 carried.

[*English*]

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 1—NATIONAL RESEARCH COUNCIL OF CANADA

Hon. Scott Brison (President of the Treasury Board, Lib.) moved:

That Vote 1, in the amount of $348,097,344, under National Research Council of Canada—Operating expenditures, in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2019, be concurred in.

The Speaker: The question is on Motion No. 78. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And five or more members having risen:

● (0705)

(The House divided on Motion No. 78, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 839)

YEAS

Members

Aldag	Alleslev
Amos	Anandasangaree
Angus	Bagnell
Bains	Bennett
Benson	Bibeau
Bratina	Brison
Brosseau	Caesar-Chavannes
Casey (Cumberland—Colchester)	Choquette
Cormier	Cuzner
Dhaliwal	Drouin
Dubourg	Duclos
Duguid	Dzerowicz
Easter	El-Khoury
Ellis	Erskine-Smith
Eyking	Eyolfson
Fergus	Fisher
Fonseca	Forbes
Fragiskatos	Fraser (West Nova)
Fraser (Central Nova)	Fuhr
Garneau	Graham
Hajdu	Harvey
Hébert	Hogg
Housefather	Hutchings
Johns	Jones
Khera	Lametti
Lamoureux	Laverdière
Lebouthillier	Lightbound
Lockhart	Longfield
MacGregor	MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Masse (Windsor West)	McCrimmon
McGuinty	McKay
McKenna	McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
McLeod (Northwest Territories)	Mendès
Mendicino	Mihychuk
Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île-des-Soeurs)	
Murray	
Nantel	Nault
Ng	O'Connell
Oliphant	Oliver
Ouellette	Paradis
Peschisolido	Peterson
Philpott	Picard
Poissant	Robillard
Rodriguez	Rogers
Ruimy	Sahota
Saini	Samson
Sangha	Sansoucy
Sarai	Scarpaleggia
Schulte	Serré

Shanahan
Sidhu (Mission — Matsqui — Fraser Canyon)
Sikand
Sohi
Spengemann
Tassi
Vandal
Vaughan
Wilson-Raybould
Yip

Sheehan
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Simms
Sorbara
Tan
Trudel
Vandenbeld
Whalen
Wrzesnewsky)
Young — 116

NAYS

Members

Aboultaif
Albrecht
Benzen
Boudrias
Clarke
Diotte
Falk (Battlefords — Lloydminster)
Genuis
Jeneroux
Kitchen
Lake
Liepert
Marcil
McLeod (Kamloops — Thompson — Cariboo)
O'Toole
Pauzé
Saroya
Strahl
Van Loan
Yurdiga — 39

Albas
Barlow
Blaney (Bellechasse — Les Etchemins — Lévis)
Brassard
Cooper
Eglinski
Finley
Gourde
Kelly
Kusie
Leitch
Lloyd
McCauley (Edmonton West)
Nater
Paul-Hus
Poilievre
Shields
Stubbs
Wagantall

PAIRED

Members

Beaulieu — Gill
Massé (Avignon — La Mitis — Matane — Matapédia)
Plamondon
Wilkinson — Zahid — 6

The Speaker: I declare Motion No.78 carried.

● (0710)

[*Translation*]

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 5—NATIONAL RESEARCH COUNCIL OF CANADA

Hon. Scott Brison (President of the Treasury Board, Lib.) moved:

That Vote 5, in the amount of $62,983,970, under National Research Council of Canada—Capital expenditures, in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2019, be concurred in.

The Speaker: The question is on Motion No. 79. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And five or more members having risen:

Business of Supply

(The House divided on Motion No. 79, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 840)

YEAS

Members

Aldag
Amos
Angus
Bains
Benson
Bratina
Brosseau
Casey (Cumberland — Colchester)
Choquette
Cuzner
Dhillon
Dubourg
Duguid
Easter
Ellis
Eyking
Fergus
Fonseca
Fragiskatos
Fraser (Central Nova)
Garneau
Hajdu
Hébert
Housefather
Johns
Khera
Lametti
Laverdière
Lightbound
Longfield
MacKinnon (Gatineau)
McCrimmon
McKay
McKinnon (Coquitlam — Port Coquitlam)
Mendès
Miller (Ville-Marie — Le Sud-Ouest — Île-des-Sœurs)
Murray
Nantel
Ng
Oliphant
Ouellette
Peschisolido
Philpott
Robillard
Rogers
Sahota
Samson
Sansoucy
Scarpaleggia
Serré
Sheehan
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Simms
Sorbara
Tan
Trudel
Vandenbeld
Whalen
Wrzesnewsky)
Young — 117

Alleslev
Anandasangaree
Bagnell
Bennett
Bibeau
Brison
Caesar-Chavannes
Champagne
Cormier
Dhaliwal
Drouin
Duclos
Dzerowicz
El-Khoury
Erskine-Smith
Eyolfson
Fisher
Fortier
Fraser (West Nova)
Fuhr
Graham
Harvey
Hogg
Hutchings
Jones
Lambropoulos
Lamoureux
Lebouthillier
Lockhart
MacGregor
Masse (Windsor West)
McGuinty
McKenna
McLeod (Northwest Territories)
Mihychuk
Nault
O'Connell
Oliver
Paradis
Peterson
Poissant
Rodriguez
Ruimy
Saini
Sangha
Sarai
Schulte
Shanahan
Sidhu (Mission — Matsqui — Fraser Canyon)
Sikand
Sohi
Spengemann
Tassi
Vandal
Vaughan
Wilson-Raybould
Yip

NAYS

Members

Aboultaif
Albrecht
Benzen
Boudrias
Clarke
Diotte
Falk (Battlefords — Lloydminster)
Genuis
Harder
Kelly

Albas
Barlow
Blaney (Bellechasse — Les Etchemins — Lévis)
Brassard
Cooper
Eglinski
Finley
Gourde
Jeneroux
Kitchen

Kusie
Leitch
Lloyd
McCauley (Edmonton West)
Nater
Pauzé
Saroya
Strahl
Van Loan
Yurdiga 39

Lake
Liepert
Marcil
McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)
O'Toole
Poilievre
Shields
Stubbs
Wagantall

PAIRED

Members

Beaulieu
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)
Plamondon
Wilkinson

Gill
Zahid 6

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 79 carried.

● (0715)

[English]

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 10—NATIONAL RESEARCH COUNCIL OF CANADA

Hon. Scott Brison (President of the Treasury Board, Lib.) moved:

That Vote 10, in the amount of $395,679,820, under National Research Council of Canada—Grants and contributions, in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2019, be concurred in.

The Speaker: The question is on Motion No. 80. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And five or more members having risen:

(The House divided on Motion No. 80, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 841)

YEAS

Members

Aldag
Amos
Angus
Bains
Benson
Bratina
Brosseau
Casey (Cumberland—Colchester)
Choquette
Cuzner
Dhillon
Dubourg
Duguid
Easter
Ellis
Eyking
Fergus
Fonseca
Fragiskatos
Fraser (Central Nova)
Garneau
Hajdu
Hébert
Housefather
Johns
Khera
Lametti
Laverdière
Lightbound
Longfield
MacKinnon (Gatineau)
McCrimmon
McKay
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
Mendès
Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île-des-Soeurs)
Murray
Nantel
Ng
Oliphant
Ouellette
Peschisolido
Philpott
Poissant
Rodriguez
Sahota
Samson
Sarai
Schulte
Sgro
Sheehan
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Simms
Sorbara
Tan
Trudel
Vandenbeld
Whalen
Wrzesnewskyj
Young 117

Allesley
Ananthasangaree
Bagnell
Bennett
Bibeau
Brison
Caesar-Chavannes
Champagne
Comtois
Dhaliwal
Drouin
Duclos
Dzerowicz
El-Khoury
Erskine-Smith
Eyolfson
Fisher
Fortier
Fraser (West Nova)
Fuhr
Graham
Harvey
Hogg
Hutchings
Jones
Lambropoulos
Lamoureux
Lebouthillier
Lockhart
MacGregor
Masse (Windsor West)
McGuinty
McKenna
McLeod (Northwest Territories)
Mihychuk
Nault
O'Connell
Oliver
Paradis
Peterson
Picard
Robillard
Rogers
Saini
Samsonovy
Scarpaleggia
Serré
Shanahan
Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)
Sikand
Sohi
Spengemann
Tassi
Vandal
Vaughan
Wilson-Raybould
Yip

NAYS

Members

Aboultaif
Albrecht
Benzen
Boudrias
Cooper
Eglinski
Finley
Gourde
Jeneroux
Kitchen
Lake
Lloyd
McCauley (Edmonton West)
Nater
Pauzé
Saroya
Strahl
Van Loan
Yurdiga 37

Albas
Barlow
Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis)
Clarke
Diotte
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Genuis
Harder
Kelly
Kusie
Leitch
Marcil
McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)
O'Toole
Poilievre
Shields
Stubbs
Wagantall

PAIRED

Members

Beaulieu
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)
Plamondon
Wilkinson

Gill
Zahid 6

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 80 carried.

[*Translation*]

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 1—CANADA SCHOOL OF PUBLIC SERVICE

Hon. Scott Brison (President of the Treasury Board, Lib.) moved:

That Vote 1, in the amount of $64,391,765, under Canada School of Public Servic— Program expenditures, in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2019, be concurred in.

The Speaker: The question is on Motion No. 81. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And five or more members having risen:

● (0720)

(The House divided on Motion No. 81, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 842)

YEAS

Members

Aldag	Alleslev
Amos	Anandasangaree
Angus	Bagnell
Bains	Bennett
Benson	Bibeau
Bratina	Brison
Brosseau	Caesar Chavannes
Casey (Cumberland—Colchester)	Chagger
Champagne	Choquette
Cormier	Cuzner
Dhaliwal	Dhillon
Drouin	Dubourg
Duclos	Duguid
Dzerowicz	Easter
El-Khoury	Ellis
Erskine-Smith	Eyking
Eyolfson	Fergus
Fisher	Fonseca
Fortier	Fragiskatos
Fraser (West Nova)	Fraser (Central Nova)
Garneau	Gerretsen
Graham	Hajdu
Harvey	Hébert
Hogg	Housefather
Hutchings	Johns
Jones	Khera
Lambropoulos	Lametti
Lamoureux	Laverdière
Lebouthillier	Lightbound
Lockhart	Longfield
MacGregor	MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Masse (Windsor West)	McCrimmon
McGuinty	McKay
McKenna	McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
McLeod (Northwest Territories)	Mendès
Mendicino	Mihychuk
Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île-des-Sœurs)	
Murray	
Nantel	Nault
Ng	O'Connell
Oliphant	Oliver
Ouellette	Paradis
Peschisolido	Peterson
Philpott	Picard
Poissant	Robillard
Rodriguez	Rogers
Sahota	Saini
Samson	Sansoucy
Sarai	Scarpaleggia
Schulte	Serré
Sgro	Shanahan
Sheehan	Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)
Sidhu (Brampton South)	Sikand
Simms	Sohi
Sorbara	Spengemann
Tan	Tassi
Vandal	Vandenbeld
Vaughan	Whalen
Wilson-Raybould	Wrzesnewskyj
Yip	Young — 118

NAYS

Members

Aboultaif	Albas
Barlow	Benzen
Boudrias	Clarke
Cooper	Diotte
Eglinski	Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Finley	Genuis
Gourde	Harder
Jeneroux	Kelly
Kent	Kitchen
Kusie	Lake
Leitch	Lloyd
Marcil	McCauley (Edmonton West)
McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)	Nater
O'Toole	Pauzé
Poilievre	Rempel
Saroya	Shields
Strahl	Stubbs
Van Loan	Wagantall
Yurdiga — 37	

PAIRED

Members

Beaulieu	Gill
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)	
Plamondon	
Wilkinson	Zahid — 6

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 81 carried.

● (0725)

[*English*]

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 1—ATOMIC ENERGY OF CANADA LIMITED

Hon. Scott Brison (President of the Treasury Board, Lib.) moved:

That Vote 1, in the amount of $1,043,539,640, under Atomic Energy of Canada Limited—Payments to Atomic Energy of Canada Limited for operating and capital expenditures , in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2019, be concurred in.

The Speaker: The question is on Motion No. 82. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And five or more members having risen:

(The House divided on Motion No. 82, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 843)

YEAS

Members

Aldag	Allesley
Amos	Anandasangaree
Angus	Bagnell
Bains	Bennett
Benson	Bibeau
Bratina	Brison
Brosseau	Caesar-Chavannes
Casey (Cumberland—Colchester)	Chagger
Champagne	Chen
Choquette	Cormier
Cuzner	Dabrusin
Dhaliwal	Dhillon
Drouin	Dubourg
Duclos	Duguid
Dzerowicz	Easter
El-Khoury	Ellis
Erskine-Smith	Eyking
Eyolfson	Fergus
Fisher	Fonseca
Fortier	Fragiskatos
Fraser (West Nova)	Fraser (Central Nova)
Gameau	Gerretsen
Graham	Hajdu
Harvey	Hébert
Hogg	Housefather
Hutchings	Johns
Jones	Khera
Lambropoulos	Lametti
Lamoureux	Laverdière
Lebouthillier	Lightbound
Lockhart	Longfield
MacGregor	MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Masse (Windsor West)	McCrimmon
McGuinty	McKay
McKenna	McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
McLeod (Northwest Territories)	Mendès
Mendicino	Mihychuk
Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île-des-Sœurs)	
Murray	
Nantel	Nault
Ng	O'Connell
Oliphant	Oliver
Ouellette	Paradis
Peschisolido	Philpott
Picard	Poissant
Robillard	Rodriguez
Rogers	Rudd
Ruimy	Sahota
Saini	Samson
Sansoucy	Sarai
Scarpaleggia	Schulte
Serré	Sgro
Shanahan	Sheehan
Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)	Sidhu (Brampton South)
Sikand	Simms
Sohi	Sorbara
Spengemann	Tan
Tassi	Vandal
Vandenbeld	Vaughan
Wilson-Raybould	Wrzesnewskyj
Yip	Young — 120

NAYS

Members

Aboultaif	Albas
Barlow	Benzen
Boudrias	Clarke
Cooper	Diotte
Eglinski	Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Finley	Genuis
Godin	Gourde
Harder	Jeneroux
Kelly	Kent
Kitchen	Kusie
Lake	Leitch
Liepert	Lloyd
Marcil	McCauley (Edmonton West)
McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)	Nater
Pauzé	Saroya
Shields	Strahl
Stubbs	Van Loan
Wagantall	Yurdiga — 36

PAIRED

Members

Beaulieu	Gill
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)	
Plamondon	
Wilkinson	Zahid — 6

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 82 carried.

● (0730)

[*Translation*]

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 1—ROYAL CANADIAN MOUNTED POLICE

Hon. Scott Brison (President of the Treasury Board, Lib.) moved:

That Vote 1, in the amount of $2,531,606,533, under Royal Canadian Mounted Police—Operating expenditures, in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2019, be concurred in.

The Speaker: The question is on Motion No. 83. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And five or more members having risen, the House proceeded to the vote.

● (0735)

[*English*]

Before the Clerk announced the results of the vote:

Ms. Ruth Ellen Brosseau: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, during the vote I noticed an influx of members coming in on the government side and they did vote, even though the voting had started. I know for sure it was the member for Scarborough Southwest and the member for Thérèse-De Blainville, but it was hard to keep track because they all came in with such a thrust. I would like the Speaker to review and maybe give them a chance to remove their votes.

[*Translation*]

The Speaker: Could the members in question tell us whether they were here when I read the question?

Mr. Jean Rioux: Mr. Speaker, I was here when you read the question.

The Speaker: Order. The hon. member for Halifax said that he was not here when I read the question.

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada and to the Minister of Health said that he did not vote.

The hon. member for Saint-Jean said that he was here when I put the question.

The hon. member for Thérèse-De Blainville said that he did not vote.

Are there any other members who would like to clarify a situation?

Mr. Gérard Deltell: Mr. Speaker, I was not mentioned by the member for Berthier—Maskinongé. I confess that I was here for the vote, but I was not here when the question was put. I therefore ask that my vote not be counted.

The Speaker: I thank the hon. member for Louis-Saint-Laurent.

(The House divided on Motion No. 83, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 844)

YEAS

Members

Aldag	Alleslev
Amos	Anandasangaree
Angus	Arseneault
Ayoub	Badawey
Bagnell	Bains
Baylis	Bennett
Bibeau	Blair
Boissonnault	Bossio
Bratina	Brison
Brosseau	Caesar-Chavannes
Casey (Cumberland—Colchester)	Casey (Charlottetown)
Chagger	Champagne
Chen	Choquette
Cormier	Cuzner
Dabrusin	Dhaliwal
Dhillon	Drouin
Dubourg	Duclos
Duguid	Dzerowicz
Easter	El Khoury
Ellis	Erskine-Smith
Eyking	Eyolfson
Fergus	Fisher
Fonseca	Fortier
Fragiskatos	Fraser (West Nova)
Fraser (Central Nova)	Garneau
Gerretsen	Goldsmith-Jones
Graham	Hajdu
Harvey	Hébert
Hogg	Housefather
Hutchings	Johns
Jones	Khera
Lambropoulos	Lametti
Lamoureux	Lapointe
Lebouthillier	Levitt
Lightbound	Lockhart
Long	Longfield
Ludwig	MacGregor
MacKinnon (Gatineau)	Maloney
Masse (Windsor West)	McCrimmon
McGuinty	McKay
McKenna	McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
McLeod (Northwest Territories)	Mendès
Mendicino	Mihychuk
Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île-des-Sœurs)	
Murray	
Nantel	Nault
Ng	O'Connell
Oliphant	Oliver
Ouellette	Paradis
Peschisolido	Petitpas Taylor
Philpott	Picard
Poissant	Rioux
Robillard	Rogers
Rudd	Ruimy
Sahota	Saini
Samson	Sangha
Sansoucy	Sarai
Scarpaleggia	Schulte
Serré	Sgro
Shanahan	Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)
Sidhu (Brampton South)	Sikand
Simms	Sohi
Sorbara	Spengemann
Tan	Tassi
Vandal	Vandenbeld
Vaughan	Whalen
Wilson-Raybould	Wrzesnewskyj
Yip	Young — 134

NAYS

Members

Aboultaif	Albas
Barlow	Benzen
Boudrias	Clarke
Cooper	Diotte
Eglinski	Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Finley	Genuis
Godin	Gourde
Harder	Jeneroux
Kelly	Kent
Kitchen	Kusie
Lake	Leitch
Liepert	Lloyd
Marcil	McCauley (Edmonton West)
McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)	Nater
Pauzé	Saroya
Shields	Stubbs
Van Loan	Yurdiga — 34

PAIRED

Members

Beaulieu	Gill
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)	
Plamondon	
Wilkinson	Zahid — 6

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 83 carried.

[*English*]

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 5—ROYAL CANADIAN MOUNTED POLICE

Hon. Bardish Chagger (for the President of the Treasury Board) moved:

That Vote 5, in the amount of $289,535,957, under Royal Canadian Mounted Police—Capital expenditures, in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2019, be concurred in.

The Speaker: The question is on Motion No. 84. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And five or more members having risen:

● (0740)

(The House divided on Motion No. 84, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 845)

YEAS

Members

Aldag	Alleslev
Amos	Anandasangaree
Angus	Arseneault
Arya	Ayoub
Badawey	Bagnell
Bains	Baylis
Bennett	Bibeau
Blair	Boissonnault
Bossio	Bratina
Brosseau	Caesar-Chavannes
Casey (Cumberland—Colchester)	Casey (Charlottetown)
Chagger	Champagne
Chen	Choquette
Cormier	Cuzner
Dabrusin	Damoff
Dhaliwal	Dubourg
Easter	Eyking
Fergus	Fillmore
Fisher	Fonseca
Fortier	Fragiskatos
Fraser (West Nova)	Fraser (Central Nova)
Fuhr	Gerretsen
Goldsmith-Jones	Graham
Hajdu	Harvey
Hébert	Hogg
Housefather	Hutchings
Iacono	Johns
Jones	Khera
Lambropoulos	Lametti
Lapointe	Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite Nation)
Lebouthillier	Levitt
Lockhart	Long
Longfield	Ludwig
MacGregor	Maloney
Masse (Windsor West)	May (Cambridge)
McGuinty	McKay
McKenna	Mendès
Mihychuk	Nantel
Ng	Oliphant
O'Regan	Paradis
Peschisolido	Petitpas Taylor
Philpott	Poissant
Rioux	Rogers
Romanado	Rudd
Sahota	Saini
Samson	Sangha
Sansoucy	Sarai
Scarpaleggia	Schiefke
Schulte	Serré
Sgro	Shanahan
Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)	Sidhu (Brampton South)
Sikand	Simms
Sorbara	Spengemann
Tan	Vandal
Vandenbeld	Whalen
Wrzesnewskyj	Yip
Young—113	

NAYS

Members

Aboultaif	Albas
Barlow	Benzen
Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis)	Boudrias
Cooper	Deltell
Diotte	Eglinski
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)	Finley
Genuis	Godin
Harder	Jeneroux
Kelly	Kent
Kitchen	Lake
Leitch	Liepert
Lloyd	Marcil
McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)	Nater
Pauzé	Saroya
Stubbs	Van Loan
Yurdiga—31	

PAIRED

Members

Beaulieu	Gill
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)	
Plamondon	
Wilkinson	Zahid—6

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 84 carried.

● (0745)

[*Translation*]

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 10—ROYAL CANADIAN MOUNTED POLICE

Hon. Bardish Chagger (for the President of the Treasury Board) moved:

That Vote 10, in the amount of $253,673,483, under Royal Canadian Mounted Police—Grants and contributions, in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2019, be concurred in.

The Speaker: The question is on Motion No. 85. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And five or more members having risen:

(The House divided on Motion No. 85, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 846)

YEAS

Members

Aldag
Amos
Angus
Arya
Badawey
Bains
Bennett
Bibeau
Blair
Bossio
Brosseau
Casey (Cumberland—Colchester)
Chagger
Chen
Cormier
Dabrusin
Dhaliwal
Easter
Fergus
Fonseca
Fragiskatos
Fraser (Central Nova)
Gerretsen
Goodale
Hajdu
Hébert
Housefather
Iacono
Jones
Lambropoulos
Lapointe
Lebouthillier
Lockhart
Longfield
MacGregor
Masse (Windsor West)
McGuinty
McKenna
Nantel
Oliphant
Paradis
Petitpas Taylor
Poissant
Rodriguez
Romanado
Sahota
Samson
Sansoucy
Scarpaleggia
Schulte
Shanahan
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Simms
Spengemann
Vandal
Whalen
Yip
Alleslev
Anandasangaree
Arseneault
Ayoub
Bagnell
Baylis
Benson
Blaikie
Boissonnault
Bratina
Caesar-Chavannes
Casey (Charlottetown)
Champagne
Choquette
Cuzner
Damoff
Dubourg
Eyking
Fillmore
Fortier
Fraser (West Nova)
Fuhr
Goldsmith-Jones
Graham
Harvey
Hogg
Hutchings
Johns
Khera
Lametti
Lanzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation)
Levitt
Long
Ludwig
Maloney
May (Cambridge)
McKay
Mendès
Ng
O'Regan
Peschisolido
Philpott
Rioux
Rogers
Rudd
Saini
Sangha
Sarai
Schiefke
Serré
Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)
Sikand
Sorbara
Tan
Vandenbeld
Wrzesnewskyj
Young
Yurdiga

114

NAYS

Members

Aboultaif
Barlow
Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis)
Cooper
Diotte
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Genuis
Harder
Kelly
Kitchen
Leitch
Lloyd
McCauley (Edmonton West)
Nater
Saroya
Van Loan
Albas
Benzen
Boudrias
Deltell
Eglinski
Finley
Godin
Jeneroux
Kent
Lake
Liepert
Marcil
McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)
Pauzé
Stubbs
Wagantall

Yurdiga 33

PAIRED

Members

Beaulieu — Gill
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia) — Plamondon
Wilkinson — Zahid

6

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 85 carried.

● (0750)

[English]

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 1—CANADIAN AIR TRANSPORT SECURITY AUTHORITY

Hon. Bardish Chagger (for the President of the Treasury Board) moved:

That Vote 1, in the amount of $586,157,871, under Canadian Air Transport Security Authority—Payments to the Canadian Air Transport Security Authority, in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2019, be concurred in.

The Speaker: The question is on Motion No. 86. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And five or more members having risen:

● (0755)

(The House divided on Motion No. 86, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 847)

YEAS

Members

Aldag
Alleslev
Anandasangaree
Arseneault
Ayoub
Bagnell
Bennett
Bibeau
Blair
Bossio
Breton
Caesar-Chavannes
Casey (Charlottetown)
Champagne
Choquette
Cuzner
Damoff
Dubourg
Eyking
Fillmore
Fortier
Fraser (West Nova)
Fuhr
Alghabra
Amos
Angus
Arya
Badawey
Baylis
Benson
Blaikie
Boissonnault
Bratina
Brosseau
Casey (Cumberland—Colchester)
Chagger
Chen
Cormier
Dabrusin
Dhaliwal
Easter
Fergus
Fisher
Fragiskatos
Fraser (Central Nova)
Gerretsen

Goldsmith-Jones	Goodale
Graham	Hajdu
Harvey	Hébert
Hogg	Housefather
Hutchings	Iacono
Johns	Khera
Lambropoulos	Lametti
Lapointe	Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation)
Laverdière	Lebouthillier
Levitt	Lockhart
Long	Longfield
Ludwig	MacGregor
Maloney	Masse (Windsor West)
May (Cambridge)	McGuinty
McKay	McKenna
Nantel	Ng
Oliphant	O'Regan
Paradis	Peschisolido
Petitpas Taylor	Philpott
Poissant	Rioux
Rodriguez	Rogers
Romanado	Rudd
Sahota	Saini
Samson	Sangha
Sansoucy	Sarai
Scarpaleggia	Schiefke
Schulte	Serré
Sgro	Shanahan
Sheehan	Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)
Sidhu (Brampton South)	Simms
Sorbara	Spengemann
Tan	Vandal
Whalen	Wrzesnewskyj
Yip	Young—114

NAYS

Members

Aboultaif	Albas
Barlow	Benzen
Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis)	Cooper
Deltell	Diotte
Eglinski	Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster)
Finley	Genuis
Godin	Gourde
Harder	Jeneroux
Kelly	Kent
Kitchen	Lake
Leitch	Liepert
Lloyd	Marcil
McCauley (Edmonton West)	McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)
Nater	Pauzé
Saroya	Shields
Stubbs	Thériault
Van Loan	Wagantall
Warkentin	Yurdiga—36

PAIRED

Members

Beaulieu	Gill
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)	
Plamondon	
Wilkinson	Zahid—6

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 86 carried.

[*Translation*]

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 40—TREASURY BOARD SECRETARIAT

Hon. Bardish Chagger (for the President of the Treasury Board) moved:

That Vote 40, in the amount of $7,040,392,000, under Treasury Board Secretariat — Budget implementation initiatives, in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2019, be concurred in.

The Speaker: The question is on Motion No. 87. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And five or more members having risen:

● (0800)

The House divided on Motion No. 87, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 848)

YEAS

Members

Aldag	Alghabra
Alleslev	Amos
Anandasangaree	Arseneault
Arya	Ayoub
Badawey	Bagnell
Baylis	Bennett
Bibeau	Blair
Boissonnault	Bossio
Bratina	Breton
Caesar-Chavannes	Casey (Charlottetown)
Chagger	Champagne
Chen	Cormier
Cuzner	Dabrusin
Damoff	DeCourcey
Dhaliwal	Dubourg
Easter	Ehsassi
Eyking	Fergus
Fillmore	Fisher
Fonseca	Fortier
Fragiskatos	Fraser (West Nova)
Fraser (Central Nova)	Fuhr
Gerretsen	Goldsmith-Jones
Goodale	Graham
Hajdu	Harvey
Hébert	Hogg
Holland	Housefather
Hutchings	Iacono
Joly	Jones
Khera	Lambropoulos
Lametti	Lapointe
Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation)	Lebouthillier
Levitt	Lockhart
Long	Longfield
Ludwig	Maloney
May (Cambridge)	McGuinty
McKay	McKenna
Mihychuk	Ng
Oliphant	O'Regan
Paradis	Peschisolido
Petitpas Taylor	Philpott
Poissant	Rioux
Rodriguez	Rogers
Romanado	Rudd
Sahota	Saini
Samson	Sangha
Sarai	Scarpaleggia
Schiefke	Schulte
Serré	Sgro
Shanahan	Sheehan
Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)	Sidhu (Brampton South)
Simms	Sorbara
Spengemann	Tan
Vandal	Vandenbeld
Whalen	Wrzesnewskyj
Yip	Young—110

NAYS

Members

Aboultaif	Albas
Angus	Barlow
Benson	Benzen
Blaikie	Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis)
Brosseau	Choquette
Cooper	Deltell
Diotte	Eglinski
Finley	Genuis
Godin	Gourde
Harder	Jeneroux
Johns	Kelly
Kent	Kitchen
Lake	Laverdière
Leitch	Liepert
Lloyd	MacGregor
Marcil	Masse (Windsor West)
McCauley (Edmonton West)	McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)
Nantel	Nater
O'Toole	Paul-Hus
Pauzé	Poilievre
Sansoucy	Saroya
Shields	Stubbs
Thériault	Van Loan
Wagantall	Warkentin — 48

PAIRED

Members

Beaulieu	Gill
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)	
Plamondon	
Wilkinson	Zahid — 6

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 87 carried.

[*English*]

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 1—DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE

Hon. Bardish Chagger (for the President of the Treasury Board) moved:

That Vote 1, in the amount of $95,205,613, under Department of Finance—Program expenditures and contributions, in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2019, be concurred in.

The Speaker: The question is on Motion No. 88. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And five or more members having risen:

● (0805)

(The House divided on Motion No. 88, which was agreed to on the following division:)

Business of Supply

(Division No. 849)

YEAS

Members

Aldag	Alghabra
Alleslev	Amos
Anandasangaree	Angus
Arseneault	Arya
Ayoub	Badawey
Bagnell	Baylis
Bennett	Benson
Bibeau	Blair
Boissonnault	Bossio
Bratina	Breton
Caesar-Chavannes	Casey (Charlottetown)
Chagger	Champagne
Chen	Cormier
Cuzner	Dabrusin
Damoff	DeCourcey
Dhaliwal	Dubourg
Easter	Ehsassi
Eyking	Fergus
Fillmore	Fisher
Fonseca	Fortier
Fragiskatos	Fraser (West Nova)
Fraser (Central Nova)	Fuhr
Goldsmith-Jones	Goodale
Graham	Hajdu
Harvey	Hébert
Hogg	Holland
Housefather	Hutchings
Iacono	Johns
Jolibois	Joly
Jones	Khera
Lambropoulos	Lametti
Lapointe	Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation)
Lavendière	Lebouthillier
Leslie	Levitt
Lockhart	Long
Longfield	Ludwig
Maloney	Masse (Windsor West)
May (Cambridge)	McGuinty
McKay	McKenna
Mihychuk	Nantel
Ng	Oliphant
O'Regan	Paradis
Peschisolido	Petitpas Taylor
Philpott	Poissant
Rioux	Robillard
Rodriguez	Rogers
Romanado	Rudd
Sahota	Saini
Samson	Sangha
Sansoucy	Sarai
Scarpaleggia	Schiefke
Schulte	Serré
Shanahan	Sheehan
Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)	Sidhu (Brampton South)
Sikand	Simms
Sorbara	Spengemann
Tan	Trudeau
Vandal	Vandenbeld
Whalen	Wrzesnewskyj
Yip	Young — 120

NAYS

Members

Aboultaif	Barlow
Benzen	Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis)
Boudrias	Brassard
Clarke	Cooper
Deltell	Diotte
Eglinski	Finley
Genuis	Godin
Gourde	Harder
Jeneroux	Kelly
Kent	Kitchen
Lake	Leitch
Lloyd	Marcil
McCauley (Edmonton West)	McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)

Nater	O'Toole
Paul-Hus	Pauzé
Poilievre	Reid
Saroya	Shields
Stubbs	Thériault
Van Loan	Wagantall
Warkentin	Yurdiga — 40

PAIRED

Members

Beaulieu	Gill
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)	
Plamondon	
Wilkinson	Zahid — 6

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 88 carried.

[*Translation*]

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 1—DEPARTMENT OF FISHERIES AND OCEANS

Hon. Bardish Chagger (for the President of the Treasury Board) moved:

That Vote 1, in the amount of $1,518,591,959, under Department of Fisheries and Oceans—Operating expenditures, in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2019, be concurred in.

The Speaker: The question is on Motion No. 89. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And five or more members having risen:

● (0810)

(The House divided on Motion No. 89, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 850)

YEAS

Members

Aldag	Alghabra
Alleslev	Amos
Angus	Arseneault
Arya	Ayoub
Badawey	Bagnell
Bains	Baylis
Beech	Bennett
Benson	Bibeau
Blair	Boissonnault
Bossio	Bratina
Breton	Caesar-Chavannes
Casey (Charlottetown)	Chagger
Champagne	Chen
Cormier	Cuzner
Dabrusin	Damoff
DeCourcey	Dhaliwal
Dubourg	Easter
Ehsassi	Eyking
Fergus	Fillmore
Fisher	Fonseca
Fortier	Fragiskatos
Fraser (West Nova)	Fraser (Central Nova)
Fuhr	Goldsmith-Jones
Goodale	Graham
Hajdu	Harvey
Hébert	Hogg
Holland	Housefather
Hutchings	Iacono
Johns	Jolibois
Joly	Jones
Khera	Lambropoulos
Lametti	Lapointe
Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation)	Laverdière
Lebouthillier	Leslie
Levitt	Lockhart
Long	Longfield
Ludwig	Maloney
Masse (Windsor West)	May (Cambridge)
McGuinty	McKay
McKenna	Mendès
Mihychuk	Nantel
Nault	Ng
Oliphant	O'Regan
Paradis	Peschisolido
Petitpas Taylor	Philpott
Poissant	Rioux
Robillard	Rodriguez
Rogers	Romanado
Rudd	Sahota
Saini	Samson
Sangha	Sansoucy
Sarai	Scarpaleggia
Schiefke	Schulte
Serré	Sgro
Shanahan	Sheehan
Sidhu (Brampton South)	Sikand
Simms	Sorbara
Spengemann	Tan
Trudeau	Vandal
Vandenbeld	Whalen
Wrzesnewskyj	Yip
Young — 123	

NAYS

Members

Aboultaif	Barlow
Benzen	Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis)
Boudrias	Brassard
Clarke	Cooper
Deltell	Diotte
Eglinski	Finley
Genuis	Godin
Gourde	Harder
Jeneroux	Kelly
Kent	Kitchen
Lake	Leitch
Lloyd	Marcil
McCauley (Edmonton West)	McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)
Nater	O'Toole
Paul-Hus	Pauzé
Poilievre	Reid
Saroya	Shields
Stubbs	Thériault
Van Loan	Wagantall
Warkentin	Yurdiga — 40

PAIRED

Members

Beaulieu	Gill
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)	
Plamondon	
Wilkinson	Zahid — 6

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 89 carried.

● (0815)

[*English*]

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 5—DEPARTMENT OF FISHERIES AND OCEANS

Hon. Bardish Chagger (for the President of the Treasury Board) moved:

That Vote 5, in the amount of $586,710,928, under Department of Fisheries and Oceans—Capital expenditures, in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2019, be concurred in.

The Speaker: The question is on Motion No. 90. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And five or more members having risen, the House proceeded to the vote.

Before the Clerk announced the results of the vote:

Mr. Charlie Angus: Mr. Speaker, I think you will find that the member for Thunder Bay—Superior North voted and then walked out. Maybe she has not been around long, but her vote cannot be counted. I think if you check the tape, that is what you will find.

The Speaker: I would remind members, and in fact the member for Timmins—James Bay is correct, that members must stay in the House in their seats during the vote. If a member leaves during the middle of a vote, before the result has been declared, then his or her vote cannot count. That was the case, in fact, in relation to the Minister of Employment and the member for Foothills on that particular vote.

● (0820)

(The House divided on Motion No. 90, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 851)

YEAS

Members

Aldag
Alleslev
Anandasangaree
Arseneault
Ayoub
Bagnell
Baylis
Bennett
Bibeau
Boissonnault
Boudrias
Breton
Caesar-Chavannes
Chagger
Chen
Cuzner
Dabrusin
Damoff
Dhaliwal
Easter
Eyking
Fillmore
Fonseca
Fragiskatos
Fraser (Central Nova)
Gerretsen
Goodale
Hajdu
Hébert
Holland
Hutchings
Johns
Joly
Laubropoulos
Lapointe
Laverdière
Leslie
Lockhart
Longfield
Mahoney
Massé (Windsor West)
McGuinty
McKenna
Mihychuk
Nault
Oliphant
Paradis
Peschisolido
Philpott
Rioux
Rodriguez
Romanado
Sahota
Samson
Sansoucy
Scarpaleggia
Schulte
Sgro
Sheehan
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Simms
Spengemann
Theriault
Vandal
Whalen
Yip — 129

Alghabra
Amos
Angus
Arya
Badawey
Bains
Beech
Benson
Blair
Bossio
Bratina
Brosseau
Casey (Charlottetown)
Champagne
Cormier
DeCourcey
Dubourg
Ehsassi
Fergus
Fisher
Fortier
Fraser (West Nova)
Fuhr
Goldsmith-Jones
Graham
Harvey
Hogg
Householder
Iacono
Jolibois
Jones
Lametti
Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation)
Lebouthillier
Levitt
Long
Ludwig
Marcil
May (Cambridge)
McKay
Mendès
Nantel
Ng
O'Regan
Pauzé
Petitpas Taylor
Poissant
Robillard
Rogers
Rudd
Saini
Sangha
Sarai
Schiefke
Serré
Shanahan
Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)
Sikand
Sorbara
Tan
Trudeau
Vandenbeld
Wrzesnewskyj

NAYS

Members

Aboultaif
Benzen
Brassard
Cooper
Diotte
Genuis
Gourde
Jeneroux
Kent
Lake
Lloyd
McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)
O'Toole
Poilievre
Rempel
Shields
Van Loan
Warkentin

Barlow
Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis)
Clarke
Dehell
Finley
Gladu
Harder
Kelly
Kusie
Leitch
McCauley (Edmonton West)
Nater
Paul-Hus
Reid
Saroya
Stubbs
Wagantall
Yurdiga — 36

PAIRED

Members

Beaulieu — Gill
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)
Plamondon
Wilkinson — Zahid — 6

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 90 carried.

[*Translation*]

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 1—DEPARTMENT OF THE ENVIRONMENT

Hon. Bardish Chagger (for the President of the Treasury Board) moved:

That Vote 1, in the amount of $752,618,946, under Department of the Environment—Operating expenditures, in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2019, be concurred in.

The Speaker: The question is on Motion No. 91. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And five or more members having risen:

● (0825)

(The House divided on Motion No. 91, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 852)

YEAS

Members

Aldag	Alghabra
Allesley	Amos
Anandasangaree	Angus
Arseneault	Arya
Ayoub	Badawey
Bagnell	Bains
Baylis	Beech
Bennett	Benson
Bibeau	Blair
Boissonnault	Bossio
Bratina	Breton
Brosseau	Caesar-Chavannes
Casey (Charlottetown)	Champagne
Chen	Cormier
Cuzner	Dabrusin
Damoff	DeCourcey
Dhaliwal	Dubourg
Easter	Ehsassi
Eyking	Fergus
Fillmore	Fisher
Fonseca	Fortier
Fragiskatos	Fraser (West Nova)
Fraser (Central Nova)	Fuhr
Gerretsen	Goldsmith-Jones
Goodale	Graham
Harvey	Hébert
Hogg	Holland
Housefather	Hutchings
Iacono	Jolibois
Joly	Jones
Khera	Lambropoulos
Lametti	Lapointe
Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation)	Laverdière
Lebouthillier	Leslie
Levitt	Lockhart
Long	Longfield
Ludwig	MacGregor
Maloney	Masse (Windsor West)
May (Cambridge)	McGuinty
McKay	McKenna
Mendès	Mihychuk
Nantel	Nault
Ng	Oliphant
O'Regan	Paradis
Peschisolido	Petitpas Taylor
Philpott	Poissant
Rioux	Robillard
Rogers	Romanado
Rudd	Sahota
Sajjan	Samson
Sangha	Samson
Sarai	Scarpaleggia
Schiefke	Schulte
Serré	Sgro
Shanahan	Sheehan
Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)	Sidhu (Brampton South)
Sikand	Simms
Sorbara	Spengemann
Tan	Trudeau
Vandal	Vandenbeld
Whalen	Wrzesnewskyj
Yip	Young — 124

NAYS

Members

Aboultaif	Albas
Barlow	Benzen
Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis)	Boudrias
Brassard	Clarke
Cooper	Deltell
Diotte	Finley
Gennis	Godin
Gourde	Harder
Jeneroux	Kelly
Kent	Kusie
Lake	Leitch
Lloyd	McCauley (Edmonton West)
McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)	Nater
Paul-Hus	Pauzé
Reid	Rempel
Saroya	Shields
Stubbs	Thériault
Van Loan	Wagantall
Warkentin	Yurdiga — 38

PAIRED

Members

Beaulieu	Gill
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)	
Plamondon	
Wilkinson	Zahid — 6

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 91 carried.

[*English*]

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 5—DEPARTMENT OF THE ENVIRONMENT

Hon. Scott Brison (President of the Treasury Board, Lib.) moved:

That Vote 5, in the amount of $76,158,025, under Department of the Environment—Capital expenditures, in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2019, be concurred in.

The Deputy Speaker: The question is on Motion No. 92. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Deputy Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And five or more members having risen:

● (0830)

(The House divided on Motion No. 92, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 853)

YEAS

Members

Aldag	Alghabra
Alleslev	Amos
Anandasangaree	Angus
Arseneault	Arya
Ayoub	Badawey
Bagnell	Bains
Baylis	Beech
Bennett	Benson
Bibeau	Blair
Boissonnault	Bossio
Bratina	Breton
Brison	Caesar-Chavannes
Casey (Charlottetown)	Chagger
Chen	Cormier
Cuzner	Dabrusin
Damoff	DeCourcey
Dhaliwal	Dubourg
Easter	Ehsassi
Ellis	Eyking
Eyolfson	Fergus
Fillmore	Fisher
Fonseca	Fragiskatos
Fraser (West Nova)	Fraser (Central Nova)
Fuhr	Gerretsen
Goldsmith-Jones	Goodale
Graham	Harvey
Hébert	Hogg
Holland	Housefather
Iacono	Jolibois
Joly	Jones
Khera	Lambropoulos
Lametti	Lapointe
Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation)	Laverdière
Lebouthillier	Leslie
Levitt	Lockhart
Long	Longfield
Ludwig	MacGregor
Maloney	Masse (Windsor West)
May (Cambridge)	McCrimmon
McGuinty	McKay
McKenna	McLeod (Northwest Territories)
Mendès	Mihychuk
Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île-des-Sœurs)	
Nantel	
Nault	Ng
Oliphant	O'Regan
Paradis	Peschisolido
Pettipas Taylor	Philpott
Picard	Poissant
Rioux	Robillard
Rogers	Romanado
Sahota	Saini
Samson	Sangha
Sansoucy	Sarai
Scarpaleggia	Schiefke
Schulte	Serré
Sgro	Shanahan
Sheehan	Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)
Sidhu (Brampton South)	Sikand
Simms	Sohara
Spengemann	Tan
Tassi	Trudeau
Vandal	Vandenbeld
Whalen	Wrzesnewskyj
Yip	Young — 128

NAYS

Members

Aboultaif	Albas
Barlow	Benzen
Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis)	Boudrias
Brassard	Clarke
Cooper	Deltell
Diotte	Eglinski
Finley	Genuis
Godin	Gourde
Harder	Jeneroux
Kelly	Kent
Kusie	Lake
Leitch	Liepert
Lloyd	McCauley (Edmonton West)
McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)	Nater
Pauzé	Poilievre
Reid	Rempel
Saroya	Shields
Stubbs	Thériault
Van Loan	Viersen
Wagantall	Warkentin
Yurdiga — 41	

PAIRED

Members

Beaulieu	Gill
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)	
Plamondon	
Wilkinson	Zahid — 6

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 92 carried.

[*Translation*]

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 1—DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES

Hon. Scott Brison (President of the Treasury Board, Lib.) moved:

That Vote 1, in the amount of $536,166,814, under Department of Natural Resources—Operating expenses, in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2019, be concurred in.

The Deputy Speaker: The question is on Motion No. 93. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Deputy Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And five or more members having risen:

● (0835)

(The House divided on Motion No. 93, which was agreed to on the following division:)

Business of Supply

(Division No. 854)

YEAS

Members

Aldag
Alleslev
Anandasangaree
Arseneault
Ayoub
Bagnell
Baylis
Bennett
Bibeau
Boissonnault
Breton
Caesar Chavannes
Chagger
Cormier
Damoff
Dhaliwal
Drouin
Duclos
Easter
El-Khoury
Eyking
Fergus
Fisher
Fortier
Fraser (West Nova)
Fuhr
Goldsmith-Jones
Graham
Harvey
Hogg
Housefather
Iacono
Jolibois
Jones
Lambropoulos
Lamoureux
Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation)
Lebouthillier
Levitt
Lockhart
Longfield
MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Masse (Windsor West)
McCrimmon
McKay
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
Mendès
Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île-des-Sœurs)
Murray
Nantel
Ng
O'Regan
Peschisolido
Philpott
Poissant
Robillard
Romanado
Ruimy
Sajjan
Sangha
Sarai
Schuerfke
Serré
Shanahan
Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)
Sikand
Sohara
Tan
Trudeau
Vandenbeld
Whalen
Yip
Alghabra
Amos
Angus
Arya
Badawey
Bains
Beech
Benson
Blair
Bratina
Brison
Casey (Charlottetown)
Chen
Dabrusin
DeCourcey
Dhillon
Dubourg
Duguid
Ehsassi
Ellis
Eyolfson
Fillmore
Fonseca
Fragiskatos
Fraser (Central Nova)
Garneau
Goodale
Grewal
Hébert
Holland
Hutchings
Johns
Joly
Khera
Lametti
Lapointe
Laverdière
Leslie
Lightbound
Long
MacGregor
Maloney
May (Cambridge)
McGuinty
McKenna
McLeod (Northwest Territories)
Mihychuk
Nault
Oliphant
Paradis
Petitpas Taylor
Picard
Rioux
Rogers
Rudd
Sahota
Samson
Sansoucy
Scarpaleggia
Schulte
Sgro
Sheehan
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Simms
Spengemann
Tassi
Vandal
Vaughan
Wrzesnewskyj
Young — 142

NAYS

Members

Aboultaif
Albas
Barlow
Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis)
Brassard
Cooper
Diotte
Finley
Gourde
Jeneroux
Kent
Lake
Liepert
Nater
Pauzé
Reid
Saroya
Stubbs
Van Loan
Wagantall
Yurdiga — 39
Benzen
Boudrias
Clarke
Deltell
Eglinski
Genuis
Harder
Kelly
Kusie
Leitch
Lloyd
O'Toole
Poilievre
Rempel
Shields
Thériault
Viersen
Warkentin

PAIRED

Members

Beaulieu
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)
Plamondon
Wilkinson
Gill
Zahid — 6

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 93 carried.

[English]

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE NO. 5—DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES

Hon. Scott Brison (President of the Treasury Board, Lib.) moved:

That Vote 5, in the amount of $20,071,752, under Department of Natural Resources—Capital expenditures, in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2019, be concurred in.

The Deputy Speaker: The question is on Motion No. 94. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Deputy Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And five or more members having risen:

• (0840)

(The House divided on Motion No. 94, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 855)

YEAS

Members

Aldag
Alleslev
Anandasangaree
Arseneault
Ayoub
Bagnell
Alghabra
Amos
Angus
Arya
Badawey
Baylis

Beech
Benson
Boissonnault
Breton
Casey (Charlottetown)
Chen
Damoff
Dhaliwal
Drouin
Duclos
Dzerowicz
Ehsassi
Ellis
Eyolfson
Fortier
Goldsmith-Jones
Graham
Harvey
Hogg
Housefather
Iacono
Jolibois
Lambropoulos
Lapointe
Laverdière
Levitt
Long
Ludwig
MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Masse (Windsor West)
McCrimmon
McKay
McLeod (Northwest Territories)
Mihychuk
Murray
Nault
O'Connell
O'Regan
Petitpas Taylor
Picard
Robillard
Romanado
Ruimy
Scarpaleggia
Sgro
Sikand
Sorbara
Tan
Trudeau
Vandenbeld
Whalen
Yip — 115

Bennett
Blair
Bratina
Brison
Chagger
Dabrusin
DeCourcey
Dhillon
Dubourg
Duguid
Easter
El-Khoury
Erskine-Smith
Fillmore
Garneau
Goodale
Grewal
Hébert
Holland
Hutchings
Johns
Joly
Lamoureux
Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation)
Leslie
Lightbound
Longfield
MacGregor
Maloney
May (Cambridge)
McGuinty
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
Mendicino
Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île-des-Sœurs)
Nantel
Ng
Oliver
Paradis
Philpott
Rioux
Rogers
Rudd
Samsoucy
Schiefke
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Simms
Spengemann
Tassi
Vandal
Vaughan
Wilson-Raybould

NAYS

Members

Aboultaif
Albrecht
Benzen
Boudrias
Clarke
Deltell
Eglinski
Gemus
Harder
Kent
Kusie
Leitch
Lloyd
McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)
O'Toole
Poilievre
Rempel
Shields
Van Loan
Wagantall
Yurdiga — 41

Albas
Barlow
Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis)
Brassard
Cooper
Diotte
Finley
Gourde
Kelly
Kitchen
Lake
Liepert
McCauley (Edmonton West)
Nater
Pauzé
Reid
Saroya
Thériault
Viersen
Warkentin

PAIRED

Members

Beaulieu — Gill
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia) — Plamondon
Wilkinson — Zahid — 6

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 94 carried.

[*Translation*]

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 1—DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Hon. Scott Brison (President of the Treasury Board, Lib.) moved:

That Vote 1, in the amount of $236,419,587, under Department of Justice—Operating expenditures, in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2019, be concurred in.

The Deputy Speaker: The question is on Motion No. 95. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Deputy Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And five or more members having risen:

● (0845)

The House divided on Motion No. 95, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 856)

YEAS

Members

Aldag
Alleslev
Anandasangaree
Arseneault
Ayoub
Bagnell
Beech
Benson
Boissonnault
Bossio
Breton
Casey (Charlottetown)
Chen
Damoff
Dhaliwal
Drouin
Duclos
Dzerowicz
Ehsassi
Ellis
Eyolfson
Fortier
Goldsmith-Jones
Graham
Harvey
Hogg
Housefather
Iacono
Jolibois

Alghabra
Amos
Angus
Arya
Badawey
Baylis
Benson
Boissonnault
Bratina
Brison
Chagger
Dabrusin
DeCourcey
Dhillon
Duguid
Easter
El-Khoury
Erskine-Smith
Fillmore
Garneau
Goodale
Grewal
Hébert
Holland
Hutchings
Johns
Joly

Lambropoulos	Lamoureux
Lapointe	Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation)
Laverdière	Leslie
Levitt	Lightbound
Long	Longfield
Ludwig	MacGregor
MacKinnon (Gatineau)	Maloney
Masse (Windsor West)	May (Cambridge)
McCrimmon	McGuinty
McKay	McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
McLeod (Northwest Territories)	Mendicino
Mihychuk	Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île-des-Sœurs)
Murray	Nantel
Nault	Ng
O'Connell	Oliver
O'Regan	Paradis
Peterson	Petitpas Taylor
Picard	Rioux
Robillard	Rogers
Romanado	Rudd
Ruimy	Sansoucy
Scarpaleggia	Sgro
Sidhu (Brampton South)	Sikand
Simms	Sohi
Sorbara	Spengemann
Tan	Tassi
Trudeau	Vandal
Vandenbeld	Vaughan
Whalen	Wilson-Raybould
Yip — 115	

NAYS

Members

Aboultaif	Albas
Albrecht	Barlow
Benzen	Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis)
Boudrias	Brassard
Clarke	Cooper
Deltell	Diotte
Eglinski	Finley
Genuis	Gourde
Harder	Kelly
Kent	Kitchen
Kusie	Lake
Leitch	Liepert
McCauley (Edmonton West)	McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)
Nater	O'Toole
Paul-Hus	Pauzé
Poilievre	Reid
Rempel	Saroya
Shields	Thériault
Trost	Van Loan
Viersen	Wagantall
Warkentin	Yurdiga — 42

PAIRED

Members

Beaulieu	Gill
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)	
Plamondon	
Wilkinson	Zahid — 6

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 95 carried.

The hon. member for Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot is rising on a point of order.

Ms. Brigitte Sansoucy: Mr. Speaker, after all these hours, I believe it would be fitting to thank the staff here with us for these votes, specifically the clerks, pages, and security staff. I took the shuttle in the middle of the night. I would like to thank the people responsible for the food services in the lobbies, the staff in the anteroom, and the library staff. It is important to note this.

● (0850)

The Deputy Speaker: That is an excellent point of order, or statement actually. It is well-deserved. Thank you on behalf of all the pages, officials, clerks, and *Journals* staff. A big team keeps the House running.

[*English*]

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 5—DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Hon. Scott Brison (President of the Treasury Board, Lib.) moved:

That Vote 5, in the amount of $391,765,319, under Department of Justice—Grants and contributions, in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2019, be concurred in.

The Deputy Speaker: The question is on Motion No. 96. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Deputy Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And five or more members having risen:

● (0855)

(The House divided on Motion No. 96, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 857)

YEAS

Members

Aldag	Alghabra
Alleslev	Amos
Anandasangaree	Angus
Arseneault	Arya
Ayoub	Badawey
Bagnell	Baylis
Beech	Benson
Blair	Boissonnault
Bossio	Boudrias
Bratina	Breton
Brison	Casey (Charlottetown)
Chagger	Chen
Dabrusin	Damoff
DeCourcey	Dhaliwal
Dhillon	Drouin
Dubourg	Duclos
Duguid	Dzerowicz
Easter	Ehsassi
El-Khoury	Ellis
Erskine-Smith	Eyking
Eyolfson	Fillmore
Fortier	Garneau
Goldsmith-Jones	Goodale
Gould	Graham
Grewal	Harvey
Hébert	Hogg
Holland	Housefather
Hutchings	Iacono
Johns	Jolibois
Joly	Lambropoulos

Lamoureux	Lapointe
Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation)	Laverdière
Levitt	Lightbound
Long	Longfield
Ludwig	MacGregor
MacKinnon (Gatineau)	Maloney
Masse (Windsor West)	May (Cambridge)
McCrimmon	McGuinty
McKay	McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
McLeod (Northwest Territories)	Mendicino
Mihychuk	Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île des Soeurs)
Murray	Nantel
Nault	Ng
O'Connell	Oliver
O'Regan	Paradis
Pauzé	Peterson
Petitpas Taylor	Picard
Rioux	Robillard
Rogers	Romanado
Rudd	Ruimy
Sansoucy	Scarpaleggia
Schiefke	Sidhu (Brampton South)
Sikand	Simms
Sohi	Spengemann
Tan	Tassi
Thériault	Trudeau
Vandenbeld	Vaughan
Whalen	Wilson-Raybould
Yip — 117	

NAYS

Members

Aboultaif	Albas
Albrecht	Barlow
Benzen	Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis)
Brassard	Clarke
Cooper	Deltell
Diotte	Eglinski
Gennis	Gourde
Harder	Kent
Kitchen	Lake
Leitch	Lloyd
McCauley (Edmonton West)	McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)
Nater	Paul-Hus
Poilievre	Reid
Richards	Saroya
Scheer	Trost
Van Loan	Viersen
Wagantall	Warkentin
Yurdiga — 35	

PAIRED

Members

Beaulieu	Gill
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)	
Plamondon	
Wilkinson	Zahid — 6

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 96 carried.

I see the hon. Leader of the Opposition on his feet on a point of order.

Hon. Andrew Scheer: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I thought I would bring to the attention of the House that on the clerk's table, the calendar shows that today is June 14. It is the custom in this place that the day is not changed until the House adjourns for the day.

However, everywhere throughout the world outside these walls, today is June 15, and it was on this day, 803 years ago, that the people of England forced King John to sign the Magna Carta, which wrested control away from the king and onto the British people, especially when it came to the issue of taxation, establishing the principle that the governed need to grant consent for taxes.

I was wondering if, on this auspicious day, the Prime Minister would end this carbon tax cover-up by agreeing to table the documents that contain the information as to how much his carbon tax will cost the Canadian people.

The Deputy Speaker: I am fairly certain that was really not a point of order but perhaps a point of debate, in a Runnymede sort of way.

[Translation]

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 1—DEPARTMENT OF CITIZENSHIP AND IMMIGRATION

Hon. Scott Brison (President of the Treasury Board, Lib.) moved:

> That Vote 1, in the amount of $822,861,988, under Department of Citizenship and Immigration—Operating expenditures, in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2019, be concurred in.

● (0900)

The Deputy Speaker: The question is on Motion No. 97. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Deputy Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And five or more members having risen:

(The House divided on Motion No. 97, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 858)

YEAS

Members

Aldag	Alghabra
Allesley	Amos
Anandasangaree	Angus
Arseneault	Arya
Ayoub	Badawey
Bagnell	Baylis
Beech	Benson
Bibeau	Blair
Boissonnault	Bossio
Bratina	Breton
Brison	Caesar-Chavannes
Casey (Charlottetown)	Chagger
Chen	Dabrusin
Damoff	DeCourcey
Dhaliwal	Dhillon
Drouin	Dubourg
Duclos	Duguid
Dzerowicz	Easter
Ehsassi	El-Khoury
Ellis	Erskine-Smith
Eyking	Eyolfson
Fillmore	Fortier
Garneau	Goldsmith-Jones
Goodale	Gould
Graham	Grewal
Harvey	Hébert

Hogg
Housefather
Iacono
Jolibois
Lambropoulos
Lapointe
Laverdière
Leslie
Lightbound
Longfield
MacGregor
Maloney
May (Cambridge)
McGuinty
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
Mendicino
Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île-des-Soeurs)
Murray
Nantel
Ng
O'Regan
Paradis
Petitpas Taylor
Rioux
Rodriguez
Rudd
Sansoucy
Schiefke
Sikand
Sohi
Tan
Trudeau
Vandenbeld
Whalen
Yip — 119

Holland
Hutchings
Johns
Joly
Lamoureux
Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation)
Lebouthillier
Levitt
Long
Ludwig
MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Masse (Windsor West)
McCrimmon
McKay
McLeod (Northwest Territories)
Mihychuk
Nault
Oliver
Ouellette
Peterson
Picard
Robillard
Rogers
Ruimy
Scarpaleggia
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Simms
Spengemann
Tassi
Vandal
Vaughan
Wilson-Raybould

NAYS

Members

Aboultaif
Albrecht
Benzen
Boudrias
Clarke
Deltell
Eglinski
Genuis
Gourde
Kelly
Kitchen
Lake
Lloyd
McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)
O'Toole
Pauzé
Reid
Saroya
Thériault
Van Loan
Wagantall
Yurdiga — 43

Albas
Barlow
Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis)
Brassard
Cooper
Diotte
Gallant
Gladu
Harder
Kent
Kusie
Leitch
McCauley (Edmonton West)
Nater
Paul-Hus
Poilievre
Richards
Scheer
Trost
Viersen
Warkentin

PAIRED

Members

Beaulieu — Gill
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)—Plamondon
Wilkinson — Zahid — 6

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 97 carried.

[*English*]

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 5— DEPARTMENT OF CITIZENSHIP AND IMMIGRATION

Hon. Scott Brison (President of the Treasury Board, Lib.) moved:

That Vote 5, in the amount of $21,816,321, under Department of Citizenship and Immigration—Capital expenditures, in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2019, be concurred in.

The Deputy Speaker: The question is on Motion No. 98. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Deputy Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And five or more members having risen:

● (0905)

(The House divided on Motion No. 98, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 859)

YEAS

Members

Aldag
Allesley
Anandasangaree
Arseneault
Ayoub
Bagnell
Beech
Bibeau
Boissonnault
Bratina
Brison
Casey (Charlottetown)
Chen
Damoff
Dhaliwal
Drouin
Duclos
Dzerowicz
Ehsassi
Ellis
Eyking
Fillmore
Garneau
Gould
Grewal
Hébert
Holland
Hutchings
Johns
Joly
Lamoureux
Lebouthillier
Levitt
Long
Ludwig
MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Masse (Windsor West)
McCrimmon
McKay
McLeod (Northwest Territories)
Mihychuk
Murray
Nault

Alghabra
Amos
Angus
Arya
Badawey
Baylis
Benson
Blair
Bossio
Breton
Caesar-Chavannes
Chagger
Dabrusin
DeCourcey
Dhillon
Dubourg
Duguid
Easter
El-Khoury
Erskine-Smith
Eyolfson
Fortier
Goodale
Graham
Harvey
Hogg
Housefather
Iacono
Jolibois
Lambropoulos
Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation)
Leslie
Lightbound
Longfield
MacGregor
Maloney
May (Cambridge)
McGuinty
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
Mendicino
Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île-des-Soeurs)
Nantel
Ng

Oliver
Ouellette
Peterson
Rioux
Rodriguez
Romanado
Ruimy
Schiefke
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Simms
Spengemann
Tassi
Vandenbeld
Whalen
Yip 115

O'Regan
Paradis
Picard
Robillard
Rogers
Rudd
Scarpaleggia
Sgro
Sikand
Sohi
Tan
Vandal
Vaughan
Wilson-Raybould

NAYS

Members

Aboultaif
Albrecht
Benzen
Clarke
Deltell
Eglinski
Gallant
Godin
Harder
Kent
Kusie
Leitch
Lloyd
Nater
Paul-Hus
Poilievre
Richards
Scheer
Trost
Viersen
Warkentin

Albas
Barlow
Brassard
Cooper
Diotte
Finley
Genuis
Gourde
Kelly
Kitchen
Lake
Liepert
McCauley (Edmonton West)
O'Toole
Pauzé
Reid
Saroya
Thériault
Van Loan
Wagantall
Yurdiga 42

PAIRED

Members

Beaulieu
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)
Plamondon
Wilkinson

Gill

Zahid 6

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 98 carried.

● (0910)

[*Translation*]

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 1—DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SAFETY AND EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS

Hon. Scott Brison (President of the Treasury Board, Lib.) moved:

That Vote 1, in the amount of $138,311,494, under Department of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness—Operating expenditures, in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2019, be concurred in.

The Deputy Speaker: The question is on Motion No. 99. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Deputy Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And five or more members having risen:

(The House divided on Motion No. 99, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 860)

YEAS

Members

Aldag
Alleslev
Anandasangaree
Arseneault
Ayoub
Bagnell
Beech
Bibeau
Boissonnault
Bratina
Caesar-Chavannes
Chagger
Dabrusin
DeCourcey
Dhillon
Dubourg
Duguid
Easter
El-Khoury
Erskine-Smith
Eyolfson
Fortier
Goldsmith-Jones
Gould
Grewal
Hébert
Holland
Hutchings
Johns
Joly
Lamoureux
Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation)
Leslie
Long
Ludwig
MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Masse (Windsor West)
McCrimmon
McKay
McLeod (Northwest Territories)
Mihychuk
Soeurs)
Murray
Nault
O'Connell
O'Regan
Paradis
Petitpas Taylor
Robillard
Rogers
Rudd
Sansoucy
Schiefke
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Simms
Sorbara
Tan
Trudeau
Vandenbeld
Whalen
Yip 119

Alghabra
Amos
Angus
Arya
Badawey
Baylis
Benson
Blair
Bossio
Brison
Casey (Charlottetown)
Chen
Damoff
Dhaliwal
Drouin
Duclos
Dzerowicz
Ehsassi
Ellis
Eyking
Filmore
Garneau
Goodale
Graham
Harvey
Hogg
Housefather
Iacono
Jolibois
Lambropoulos
Lapointe
Lebouthillier
Lightbound
Longfield
MacGregor
Maloney
May (Cambridge)
McGuinty
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
Mendicino
Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île-des-

Nantel
Ng
Oliver
Ouellette
Peterson
Rioux
Rodriguez
Romanado
Ruimy
Scarpaleggia
Sgro
Sikand
Sohi
Spengemann
Tassi
Vandal
Vaughan
Wilson-Raybould

NAYS

Members

Aboultaif
Albrecht
Brassard
Cooper

Albas
Benzen
Clarke
Diotte

Eglinski
Gallant
Gladu
Gourde
Kelly
Kitchen
Lake
Liepert
McLeod (Kamloops Thompson Cariboo)
O'Toole
Poilievre
Richards
Scheer
Trost
Wagantall
Finley
Genuis
Godin
Harder
Kent
Kusie
Leitch
Lloyd
Nater
Pauzé
Reid
Saroya
Thériault
Van Loan
Yurdiga 38

PAIRED

Members

Beaulieu
Massé (Avignon La Mitis Matane Matapédia)
Plamondon
Wilkinson
Gill
Zahid 6

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 99 carried.

● (0915)

[*English*]

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 5—DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SAFETY AND EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS

Hon. Scott Brison (President of the Treasury Board, Lib.) moved:

That Vote 5, in the amount of $1,007,864,906, under Department of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness—Grants and contributions, in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2019, be concurred in.

The Deputy Speaker: The question is on Motion No. 100. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Deputy Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And five or more members having risen:

(The House divided on the Motion No. 100, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 861)

YEAS

Members

Aldag
Alleslev
Anandasangaree
Arseneault
Ayoub
Bagnell
Beech
Bibeau
Boissonnault
Alghabra
Amos
Angus
Arya
Badawey
Baylis
Benson
Blair
Bossio
Bratina
Caesar Chavannes
Chagger
Damoff
Dhillon
Dubourg
Duguid
Easter
El Khoury
Erskine-Smith
Eyolfson
Fortier
Goldsmith-Jones
Gould
Grewal
Hébert
Holland
Hutchings
Johns
Joly
Lamoureux
Lauzon (Argenteuil La Petite-Nation)
Lebouthillier
Lightbound
Longfield
MacGregor
Maloney
May (Cambridge)
McGuinty
McKinnon (Coquitlam Port Coquitlam)
Mendicino
Miller (Ville-Marie Le Sud-Ouest Île-des-Sœurs)
Murray
Nantel
Ng
Oliver
Ouellette
Pauzé
Petitpas Taylor
Quach
Rodriguez
Romanado
Rumy
Scarpaleggia
Sgro
Sikand
Sohi
Tan
Thériault
Vandal
Vaughan
Wilson-Raybould
Brison
Casey (Charlottetown)
Chen
DeCourcey
Drouin
Duclos
Dzerowicz
Ehsassi
Ellis
Eyking
Fillmore
Garneau
Goodale
Graham
Harvey
Hogg
Housefather
Iacono
Jolibois
Lambropoulos
Lapointe
Laverdière
Leslie
Long
Ludwig
MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Masse (Windsor West)
McCrimmon
McKay
McLeod (Northwest Territories)
Mihychuk
Nault
O'Connell
O'Regan
Paradis
Peterson
Picard
Rioux
Rogers
Rudd
Sansoucy
Schiefke
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Simms
Sorbara
Tassi
Trudeau
Vandenbeld
Whalen
Yip 120

NAYS

Members

Albas
Benzen
Brassard
Cooper
Eglinski
Gallant
Gladu
Gourde
Kelly
Kitchen
Lake
Liepert
McCauley (Edmonton West)
Nater
Reid
Saroya
Trost
Viersen
Yurdiga 37
Albrecht
Blaney (Bellechasse Les Etchemins Lévis)
Clarke
Diotte
Finley
Genuis
Godin
Harder
Kent
Kusie
Leitch
Lloyd
McLeod (Kamloops Thompson Cariboo)
Poilievre
Richards
Shields
Van Loan
Wagantall

PAIRED

Members

Beaulieu
Massé (Avignon La Mitis Matane Matapédia)
Plamondon
Gill

Wilkinson Zahid 6

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 100 carried.

● (0920)

[*Translation*]

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 1—ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNALS SUPPORT SERVICE OF CANADA

Hon. Scott Brison (President of the Treasury Board, Lib.) moved:

That Vote 1, in the amount of $55,556,354, under Administrative Tribunals Support Service of Canada—Program expenditures, in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2019, be concurred in.

The Deputy Speaker: The question is on Motion No. 101. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Deputy Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And five or more members having risen:

● (0925)

[*English*]

(The House agreed on Motion No. 101, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 862)

YEAS

Members

Aldag	Alghabra
Alleslev	Amos
Anandasangaree	Angus
Arseneault	Arya
Ayoub	Badawey
Bagnell	Bains
Baylis	Beech
Benson	Bibeau
Blair	Boissonnault
Bossio	Bratina
Brison	Brosseau
Caesar-Chavannes	Casey (Charlottetown)
Chagger	Chen
Damoff	DeCourcey
Dhillon	Drouin
Dubourg	Duclos
Duguid	Dzerowicz
Easter	Ehsassi
El-Khoury	Ellis
Erskine-Smith	Eyking
Eyolfson	Fillmore
Fortier	Garneau
Goldsmith-Jones	Goodale
Gould	Graham
Grewal	Harvey
Hébert	Hogg
Holland	Housefather
Hutchings	Iacono
Johns	Jolibois
Joly	Lambropoulos
Lamoureux	Lapointe
Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation)	Laverdière
Lebouthillier	Leslie
Levitt	Lightbound
Long	Longfield
Ludwig	MacGregor
MacKinnon (Gatineau)	Maloney
Masse (Windsor West)	May (Cambridge)
McCrimmon	McGuinty
McKay	McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
McLeod (Northwest Territories)	Mendicino
Mihychuk	Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île-des-Sœurs)
Murray	Nantel
Nault	Ng
O'Connell	Oliver
Ouellette	Paradis
Peterson	Petitpas Taylor
Philpott	Picard
Quach	Rioux
Rodriguez	Rogers
Romanado	Rudd
Ruimy	Sansoucy
Scarpaleggia	Schiefke
Sgro	Sidhu (Brampton South)
Sikand	Simms
Sohi	Sorbara
Spengemann	Tan
Tassi	Trudeau
Vandal	Vandenbeld
Vaughan	Whalen
Wilson-Raybould	Yip 122

NAYS

Members

Albas	Albrecht
Barlow	Benzen
Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis)	Brassard
Clarke	Cooper
Diotte	Eglinski
Finley	Gallant
Genuis	Gladu
Godin	Harder
Kelly	Kitchen
Kusie	Lake
Leitch	Liepert
Lloyd	McCauley (Edmonton West)
McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)	Nater
Poilievre	Reid
Rempel	Richards
Saroya	Shields
Trost	Van Loan
Viersen	Wagantall
Yurdiga 37	

PAIRED

Members

Beaulieu	Gill
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)	
Plamondon	
Wilkinson	Zahid 6

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 101 carried.

Mr. Pat Kelly: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I know it has been a very long evening and I know all members do their best to operate and vote in accordance of the rules. However, if you review the tape, I think you will find that the member for Sackville—Preston—Chezzetcook was not in the chamber when you began to read the motion, and his vote ought not to count.

The Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I thank the hon. member for Calgary Rocky Ridge for bringing this to the attention of the House. I actually observed the vote in the fifth row, and the hon. member did not in fact stand during the vote.

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 1—CANADA BORDER SERVICES AGENCY

Hon. Scott Brison (President of the Treasury Board, Lib.) moved:

That Vote 1, in the amount of $1,442,043,878, under Canada Border Services Agency—Operating expenditures, in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2019, be concurred in.

The Deputy Speaker: The question is Motion No. 102. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Deputy Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And five or more members having risen:

● (0930)

(The House divided on Motion No. 102, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 863)

YEAS

Members

Aldag
Alleslev
Anandasangaree
Arya
Badawey
Bains
Beech
Bibeau
Boissonnault
Bratina
Brison
Caesar-Chavannes
Chagger
Cormier
Damoff
Dhaliwal
Dubourg
Easter
Ellis
Eyking
Fillmore
Fonseca
Fragiskatos
Fraser (Central Nova)
Garneau
Goldsmith-Jones
Gould
Grewal
Hébert
Holland
Hutchings
Johns
Joly
Lambropoulos
Lamoureux
Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation)
Lebouthillier
Levitt
Lockhart
Longfield
Alghabra
Amos
Arseneault
Ayoub
Bagnell
Baylis
Bennett
Blair
Bossio
Breton
Brosseau
Casey (Charlottetown)
Chen
Dabrusin
DeCourcey
Dhillon
Duclos
El-Khoury
Erskine-Smith
Eyolfson
Fisher
Fortier
Fraser (West Nova)
Fuhr
Gerretsen
Goodale
Graham
Harvey
Hogg
Housefather
Iacono
Jolibois
Jones
Lametti
Lapointe
Laverdière
Leslie
Lightbound
Long
Ludwig
MacGregor
Maloney
May (Cambridge)
McGuinty
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
Mendès
Mihychuk
Soeurs)
Murray
Nault
O'Connell
O'Regan
Paradis
Peterson
Philpott
Quach
Robillard
Rogers
Rudd
Sahota
Samson
Sarai
Schiefke
Shanahan
Sikand
Sohi
Spengemann
Tassi
Trudeau
Vandenbeld
Whalen
Yip
MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Masse (Windsor West)
McCrimmon
McKay
McLeod (Northwest Territories)
Mendicino
Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île-des-
Nantel
Ng
Oliver
Ouellette
Pauzé
Petitpas Taylor
Picard
Rioux
Rodriguez
Romanado
Ruimy
Saini
Samsoucy
Scarpaleggia
Sgro
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Simms
Sorbara
Tan
Thériault
Vandal
Vaughan
Wilson-Raybould
Young 142

NAYS

Members

Aboultaif
Albrecht
Benzen
Brassard
Cooper
Diotte
Eglinski
Gallant
Gladu
Kelly
Kusie
Leitch
Lloyd
McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)
Poilievre
Rempel
Saroya
Shields
Trost
Viersen
Warkentin
Albas
Barlow
Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis)
Clarke
Deltell
Doherty
Finley
Genuis
Godin
Kitchen
Lake
Liepert
McCauley (Edmonton West)
Nater
Reid
Richards
Scheer
Strahl
Van Loan
Wagantall
Yurdiga 42

PAIRED

Members

Beaulieu
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)
Plamondon
Wilkinson
Gill
Zahid 6

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 102 carried.

[*Translation*]

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 5—CANADA BORDER SERVICES AGENCY

Hon. Scott Brison (President of the Treasury Board, Lib.) moved:

That Vote 5, in the amount of $197,930,474, under Canada Border Services Agency—Capital expenditures, in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2019, be concurred in.

The Deputy Speaker: The question is on Motion No. 103. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Deputy Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And five or more members having risen:

● (0935)

(The House divided on Motion No. 103, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 864)

YEAS

Members

Aldag	Alghabra
Alleslev	Amos
Arseneault	Arya
Ayoub	Badawey
Bagnell	Bains
Baylis	Beech
Bennett	Bibeau
Blair	Boissonnault
Bossio	Bratina
Breton	Brison
Brosseau	Caesar-Chavannes
Casey (Charlottetown)	Chagger
Chen	Cormier
Cuzner	Dabrusin
Damoff	DeCourcey
Dhaliwal	Dhillon
Drouin	Dubourg
Duclos	Dzerowicz
Easter	El-Khoury
Erskine-Smith	Eyking
Eyolfson	Fillmore
Fisher	Fonseca
Fortier	Fragiskatos
Fraser (West Nova)	Fraser (Central Nova)
Fuhr	Garneau
Gerretsen	Goldsmith-Jones
Goodale	Gould
Graham	Grewal
Harvey	Hébert
Hogg	Holland
Hutchings	Iacono
Johns	Jolibois
Jones	Khera
Lambropoulos	Lametti
Lamoureux	Lapointe
Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation)	Laverdière
Lebouthillier	Leslie
Levitt	Lightbound
Lockhart	Long
Longfield	Ludwig
MacKinnon (Gatineau)	Maloney
Masse (Windsor West)	May (Cambridge)
McCrimmon	McGuinty
McKay	McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
McLeod (Northwest Territories)	Mendès
Mendicino	Mihychuk
Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île-des-Sœurs)	
Murray	
Nantel	Nault
Ng	O'Connell
Oliphant	Oliver
O'Regan	Ouellette
Paradis	Pauzé
Peschisolido	Peterson
Petitpas Taylor	Philpott
Picard	Poissant
Quach	Rioux
Robillard	Rogers
Romanado	Rudd
Ruimy	Sahota
Saini	Samson
Samsoucy	Sarai
Scarpaleggia	Schiefke
Schulte	Serré
Shanahan	Sheehan
Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)	Sikand
Simms	Sohi
Sorbara	Spengemann
Tan	Tassi
Thériault	Trudeau
Vandal	Vandenbeld
Vaughan	Whalen
Wilson-Raybould	Yip
Young—145	

NAYS

Members

Aboultaif	Albas
Albrecht	Barlow
Benzen	Bergen
Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis)	Brassard
Clarke	Cooper
Deltell	Diotte
Doherty	Eglinski
Finley	Gallant
Genuis	Gladu
Godin	Harder
Kelly	Kent
Kitchen	Kusie
Lake	Leitch
Liepert	Lloyd
McCauley (Edmonton West)	McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)
Nater	O'Toole
Poilievre	Reid
Rempel	Richards
Saroya	Scheer
Shields	Strahl
Trost	Van Loan
Viersen	Wagantall
Warkentin	Yurdiga—46

PAIRED

Members

Beaulieu	Gill
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)	
Plamondon	
Wilkinson	Zahid—6

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 103 carried.

● (0940)

[*English*]

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 1—CANADA MORTGAGE AND HOUSING CORPORATION

Hon. Scott Brison (President of the Treasury Board, Lib.) moved:

That Vote 1, in the amount of $2,427,435,894, under Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation—Repayments to the Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation, in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2019, be concurred in.

The Deputy Speaker: The question is on Motion No. 104. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Deputy Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And five or more members having risen:

● (0945)

(The House divided on Motion No. 104, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 865)

YEAS

Members

Aldag	Alghabra
Alleslev	Amos
Arseneault	Arya
Ayoub	Badawey
Bagnell	Bains
Baylis	Beech
Bennett	Benson
Bibeau	Blair
Boissonnault	Bossio
Bratina	Breton
Brosseau	Caesar Chavannes
Casey (Charlottetown)	Chagger
Chen	Cormier
Cuzner	Dabrusin
Damoff	DeCourcey
Dhaliwal	Dhillon
Drouin	Dubourg
Duclos	Dzerowicz
Ehsassi	El Khoury
Ellis	Erskine Smith
Eyking	Eyolfson
Fillmore	Fisher
Fonseca	Fragiskatos
Fraser (West Nova)	Fraser (Central Nova)
Fuhr	Garneau
Gerretsen	Goldsmith Jones
Goodale	Gould
Graham	Grewal
Harvey	Hébert
Hogg	Holland
Housefather	Hutchings
Iacono	Johns
Jolibois	Jones
Khera	Lambropoulos
Lametti	Lamoureux
Lapointe	Lauzon (Argenteuil — La Petite Nation)
Laverdière	Lebouthillier
Levitt	Lightbound
Lockhart	Long
Longfield	Ludwig
MacKinnon (Gatineau)	Maloney
Masse (Windsor West)	May (Cambridge)
McCrimmon	McGuinty
McKay	McKinnon (Coquitlam — Port Coquitlam)
McLeod (Northwest Territories)	Mendès
Mendicino	Mihychuk
Miller (Ville Marie — Le Sud Ouest — Île des Soeurs)	
Murray	
Nantel	Nault
Ng	O'Connell
Oliphant	Oliver
O'Regan	Ouellette
Paradis	Peschisolido
Peterson	Petitpas Taylor
Philpott	Picard
Poissant	Quach
Rioux	Robillard
Rogers	Romanado
Rudd	Rumy
Sahota	Saini
Samson	Sangha
Sansoucy	Sarai
Scarpaleggia	Schuetke
Schulte	Serré
Sgro	Shanahan
Sheehan	Sidhu (Mission — Matsqui — Fraser Canyon)
Sikand	Simms
Sohi	Sorbara
Spengemann	Tan
Tassi	Trudeau
Vandal	Vandenbeld
Vaughan	Whalen
Wilson-Raybould	Yip
Young — 145	

NAYS

Members

Aboultaif	Albas
Albrecht	Barlow
Benzen	Bergen
Blaney (Bellechasse — Les Etchemins — Lévis)	Brassard
Clarke	Cooper
Diotte	Doherty
Eglinski	Finley
Gemmis	Gladu
Godin	Gourde
Harder	Kelly
Kent	Kitchen
Kusie	Lake
Lauzon (Stormont — Dundas — South Glengarry)	Leitch
Liepert	Lloyd
McCauley (Edmonton West)	McLeod (Kamloops — Thompson — Cariboo)
Nater	O'Toole
Paul-Hus	Pauzé
Poilievre	Reid
Rempel	Richards
Saroya	Scheer
Shields	Strahl
Trost	Van Loan
Viersen	Wagantall
Warkentin	Yurdiga — 48

PAIRED

Members

Beaulieu	Gill
Massé (Avignon — La Mitis — Matane — Matapédia)	
Plamondon	
Wilkinson	Zahid — 6

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 104 carried.

[*Translation*]

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 1—CANADA POST CORPORATION

Hon. Scott Brison (President of the Treasury Board, Lib.) moved:

That Vote 1, in the amount of $22,210,000, under Canada Post Corporation — Payments to the Canada Post Corporation for special purposes, in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2019, be concurred in.

The Deputy Speaker: The question is on Motion No. 105. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Deputy Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And five or more members having risen:

● (0950)

(The House divided on Motion No. 105, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 866)

YEAS

Members

Aldag	Alghabra
Allesley	Amos
Anandasangaree	Arseneault
Arya	Ayoub
Badawey	Bagnell
Bains	Baylis
Beech	Bennett
Benson	Bibeau
Blair	Boissonnault
Bossio	Bratina
Breton	Brison
Brosseau	Caesar Chavannes
Casey (Charlottetown)	Chagger
Chen	Cormier
Cuzner	Dabrusin
Damoff	DeCourcey
Dhaliwal	Dhillon
Drouin	Dubourg
Duclos	Dzerowicz
Ehsassi	El Khoury
Ellis	Erskine Smith
Eyking	Eyolfson
Fillmore	Fisher
Fonseca	Fortier
Fragiskatos	Fraser (West Nova)
Fraser (Central Nova)	Fuhr
Garneau	Gerretsen
Goldsmith Jones	Goodale
Gould	Graham
Grewal	Harvey
Hébert	Hogg
Holland	Housefather
Hutchings	Iacono
Johns	Jolebois
Joly	Jones
Khera	Lambropoulos
Lametti	Lamoureux
Lapointe	Lauzon (Argenteuil — La Petite Nation)
Laverdière	Leboutbillier
Leslie	Levitt
Lightbound	Lockhart
Long	Longfield
Ludwig	MacGregor
MacKinnon (Gatineau)	Maloney
Masse (Windsor West)	May (Cambridge)
McCrimmon	McGuinty
McKay	McKinnon (Coquitlam — Port Coquitlam)
McLeod (Northwest Territories)	Mendès
Mendicino	Mihychuk
Miller (Ville Marie — Le Sud Ouest — Île des Soeurs)	
Murray	
Nantel	Nault
Ng	O'Connell
Oliphant	Oliver
O'Regan	Ouellette
Paradis	Peschisolido
Peterson	Petitpas Taylor
Philpott	Picard
Poissant	Quach
Rioux	Robillard
Rodriguez	Rogers
Romanado	Rudd
Ruimy	Sahota
Saini	Samson
Sangha	Sansoucy
Scarpaleggia	Schiefke
Schulte	Serré
Sgro	Shanahan
Sheehan	Sidhu (Mission — Matsqui — Fraser Canyon)
Sidhu (Brampton South)	Sikand
Simms	Sohi
Sorbara	Spengemann
Tan	Tassi
Trudeau	Vandal
Vandenbeld	Vaughan
Whalen	Wilson-Raybould
Wrzesnewskyj	Yip
Young — 153	

NAYS

Members

Aboultaif	Albas
Albrecht	Barlow
Benzen	Bergen
Blaney (Bellechasse — Les Etchemins — Lévis)	Brassard
Clarke	Cooper
Diotte	Doherty
Eglinski	Finley
Gallant	Genuis
Gladu	Godin
Gourde	Harder
Kelly	Kent
Kitchen	Kusie
Lake	Lauzon (Stormont — Dundas — South Glengarry)
Leitch	Liepert
Lloyd	McCauley (Edmonton West)
McLeod (Kamloops — Thompson — Cariboo)	Nater
Paul-Hus	Pauzé
Poilievre	Reid
Rempel	Richards
Saroya	Scheer
Shields	Strahl
Stubbs	Thériault
Trost	Van Loan
Viersen	Wagantall
Warkentin	Yurdiga — 50

PAIRED

Members

Beaulieu	Gill
Massé (Avignon — La Mitis — Matane — Matapédia)	
Plamondon	
Wilkinson	Zahid — 6

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 105 carried.

[English]

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 1—CANADA REVENUE AGENCY

Hon. Scott Brison (President of the Treasury Board, Lib.) moved:

That Vote 1, in the amount of $3,217,340,057, under Canada Revenue Agency—Operating expenditures and contributions, in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2019, be concurred in.

The Deputy Speaker: The question is on Motion No. 106. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Deputy Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And five or more members having risen:

● (0955)

(The House divided on Motion No. 106, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 867)

YEAS

Members

Aldag	Alghabra
Alleslev	Ames
Anandasangaree	Angus
Arseneault	Arya
Ayoub	Badawey
Bagnell	Bains
Baylis	Beech
Bennett	Benson
Bibeau	Blair
Boissonnault	Bossio
Bratina	Breton
Brison	Brosseau
Caesar-Chavannes	Casey (Charlottetown)
Chagger	Chen
Cormier	Cuzner
Dabrusin	Damoff
DeCourcey	Dhaliwal
Dhillon	Drouin
Dubourg	Duclos
Dzerowicz	Easter
Ehsassi	El-Khoury
Ellis	Erskine-Smith
Eyking	Eyolfson
Fergus	Fillmore
Fisher	Fonseca
Fortier	Fragiskatos
Fraser (West Nova)	Fraser (Central Nova)
Fuhr	Garneau
Garrison	Gerretsen
Gohhuuth Jones	Goodale
Gould	Graham
Grewal	Harvey
Hébert	Hogg
Holland	Housefather
Hutchings	Iacono
Johns	Joliboi
Joly	Jones
Khera	Lambropoulos
Lametti	Lamoureux
Lapointe	Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation)
Laverdière	Lebouthillier
Leslie	Levitt
Lightbound	Lockhart
Long	Longfield
Ludwig	MacGregor
MacKinnon (Gatineau)	Maloney
Masse (Windsor West)	May (Cambridge)
McCrimmon	McGuinty
McKay	McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
McLeod (Northwest Territories)	Mendès
Mendicino	Mihychuk
Miller (Ville-Marie—Le Sud-Ouest—Île-des-Sœurs)	
Murray	
Nantel	Nault
Ng	O'Connell
Oliphant	Oliver
O'Regan	Ouellette
Paradis	Peschisolido
Peterson	Petitpas Taylor
Philpott	Picard
Poissant	Quach
Rioux	Robillard
Rodriguez	Rogers
Romanado	Rudd
Ruimy	Sahota
Saini	Samson
Sangha	Sansoucy
Sarai	Scarpaleggia
Schulte	Serré
Sgro	Shanahan
Sheehan	Sidhu (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon)
Sidhu (Brampton South)	Sikand
Simms	Sohi
Sorbara	Spengemann
Tan	Tassi
Trudeau	Vandal
Vandenbeld	Vaughan
Whalen	Wilson-Raybould
Wrzesnewskyj	Yip
Young—157	

NAYS

Members

Aboultaif	Albas
Albrecht	Barlow
Benzen	Bergen
Blaney (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis)	Brassard
Clarke	Cooper
Deltell	Diotte
Doherty	Eglinski
Finley	Gallant
Genuis	Gladu
Godin	Gourde
Harder	Hoback
Kelly	Kent
Kitchen	Kusie
Lake	Lauzon (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry)
Leitch	Liepert
Lloyd	McCauley (Edmonton West)
McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo)	Nater
Paul-Hus	Pauzé
Poilievre	Reid
Rempel	Richards
Saroya	Scheer
Shields	Strahl
Stubbs	Thériault
Trost	Van Loan
Viersen	Waugantall
Warkentin	Yurdiga—52

PAIRED

Members

Beaulieu	Gill
Massé (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia)	
Plamondon	
Wilkinson	Zahid—6

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 106 carried.

[*Translation*]

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 5—CANADA REVENUE AGENCY

Hon. Scott Brison (President of the Treasury Board, Lib.) moved:

That Vote 5, in the amount of $70,775,481, under Canada Revenue Agency—Capital expenditures, in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2019, be concurred in.

The Deputy Speaker: The question is on Motion No. 107. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: On division.

(Motion No. 107 agreed to)

[*English*]

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 1—CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

Hon. Scott Brison (President of the Treasury Board, Lib.): moved:

That Vote 1, in the amount of $1,097,768,365, under Canadian Broadcasting Corporation—Payments to the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation for operating expenditures, in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2019, be concurred in.

The Deputy Speaker: The question is on Motion No. 108. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: On division.

(Motion No. 108 agreed to)

[*Translation*]

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 5—CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

Hon. Scott Brison (President of the Treasury Board, Lib.) moved:

That Vote 5, in the amount of $4,000,000, under Canadian Broadcasting Corporation—Payments to the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation for working capital, in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2019, be concurred in.

The Deputy Speaker: The question is on Motion No. 109. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: On division.

(Motion No. 109 agreed to)

[*English*]

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 10—CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

Hon. Scott Brison (President of the Treasury Board, Lib.) moved:

That Vote 10, in the amount of $109,009,000, under Canadian Broadcasting Corporation—Payments to the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation for capital expenditures, in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2019, be concurred in.

The Deputy Speaker: The question is on Motion No. 110. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: On division.

(Motion No. 110 agreed to)

[*Translation*]

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 1—CANADIAN HIGH ARCTIC RESEARCH STATION

Hon. Scott Brison (President of the Treasury Board, Lib.) moved:

That Vote 1, in the amount of $28,089,505, under Canadian High Arctic Research Station—Program expenditures, grants and contributions, in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2019, be concurred in.

● (1000)

The Deputy Speaker: The question is on Motion No. 111. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: On division.

(Motion No. 111 agreed to)

[*English*]

Mr. Mark Strahl (Chilliwack—Hope, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. If you seek it you will find unanimous consent for the following motion. I move:

That, notwithstanding any Standing Order or usual practices of the House, the remaining motions to concur in all opposed items listed on the notice paper under main estimates be deemed adopted on division, and that the motion to concur in the unopposed votes be deemed adopted on division; and

That Bill C-80, An Act for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money for the federal public administration for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2019, be deemed introduced and read a first time, deemed read a second time, deemed referred to a committee of the whole, deemed considered by the committee of the whole and reported back to the House without amendment, deemed concurred in at report stage, deemed read a third time and passed on division.

The Deputy Speaker: Does the hon. chief opposition whip have the unanimous consent of the House to propose this motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Deputy Speaker: The House has heard the terms of the motion. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

(Motion agreed to)

(Motion to concur in the main estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2019, deemed agreed to)

(Bill C-80 deemed introduced and read a first time, read a second time, referred to committee of the whole, considered by committee of the whole, reported to the House without amendment, concurred in at report stage, read a third time, and passed)

ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 38 deemed to have been moved.

[*English*]

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Mr. Garnett Genuis (Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to speak today about Hong Kong.

Hong Kong is a special and beautiful place. It also in many ways is a place of contrast. Breathtaking natural beauty is interspersed with urban beauty as apartments rise and mountains rise even higher. East meets west and the cutting edge of modernity grows in an environment with clear and evident tradition. It is also a place that has unfortunately never known true democracy, yet which is also historically at a very high level of freedom.

I went to Hong Kong last fall with our foreign affairs committee and quickly fell in love with it. It is a beautiful place possessed of an inspiring order, poise, and dignity.

Hong Kong is part of China and it has an important role to play as a light for freedom in China. When Hong Kong joined China, it was under a commitment that Hong Kong's distinctiveness would be respected. The structure was to be one country, two systems. It has a genuine market economy and it has a legislature.

However, Hong Kong is not a true democracy. There are vast differences in the number of electors in each constituency. In some cases, companies as opposed to individuals are the electors. The system is not a proper democracy and it creates the condition for significant manipulation by the government on the mainland.

On the other hand, despite lacking proper democratic institutions, the people of Hong Kong stand up for their freedom and for the freedom of all Chinese citizens. During our trip we met with NGOs in Hong Kong who offered us more genuine insight than we were able to receive on the mainland. I met and was inspired by pro-democracy legislators and activists who have risked everything to stand up for their freedom.

The question that I raised in the House earlier this week with respect to Hong Kong was a question of human rights but also a question of political structure. The Government of Canada needs to stand up for the particular political arrangements that Hong Kong was promised and for the people's fundamental right to real democracy. If China will not keep its commitments to Hong Kong, how can we expect it to keep its commitments to anyone else?

Perhaps the best illustration of what makes Hong Kong special is what happens on June 4. In 1989, pro-democracy protestors were massacred in Beijing. Troops fired on civilians with automatic weapons and tanks. In every other part of China this occasion is not marked in any public way, but in Hong Kong people mark the occasion and keep the memory of those who died alive on Chinese soil. They did not die in vain.

I raised a specific question about Hong Kong, dealing with the heroes of Hong Kong's democracy movement who are now being given absurd prison sentences for no justifiable reason. Has the government spoken publicly or to the Chinese government about these individual cases or about the declining political situation in Hong Kong in terms of respect for Hong Kong's freedom? Has Hong Kong come up in discussions with the Government of China? We think it should and we would like to know if it has.

This was my question this week. It was not answered in question period, so I am asking it again. Has the government specifically discussed these cases or the lack of respect for Hong Kong's basic law in general, publicly or directly, with the Government of China?

● (1005)

Mr. Matt DeCourcey (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, after what I know has been a long and difficult night for my colleague across the way, I am glad we have a chance to exchange in this important conversation.

My colleague will know that the promotion and protection of human rights is a core and fundamental part of our foreign policy, and it remains an unwavering priority for our government, for Canadians, and for Canada's engagement abroad. We are well aware of the recent sentencing of Edward Leung Tin-kei for his conviction on the charge of rioting.

The ability to gather and protest peacefully is a core human right. Hong Kong is widely recognized as an open society with a long tradition of popular engagement in political expression, and we support efforts to ensure this tradition continues. Canada strongly supports the rule of law and the independence of the judiciary in Hong Kong under the one country, two systems principle under Hong Kong basic law. Hong Kong's protection of civil and political rights guaranteed under the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights has been essential for the integrity of this framework.

Canada champions the values of pluralism, democracy, inclusive and accountable governance and respect for diversity, and universal human rights, and we do so at every opportunity. Our government has never and will never hesitate to voice our human rights concerns at every possible opportunity in our exchanges with China. This is a core component of our engagement, of Canada's engagement with China. Canada has expressed concerns about the shrinking space for civil society in China, and raises human rights situations in China with Chinese officials regularly. I have had the chance to do so, as has my colleague sitting beside me.

Canadian engagement on human rights is done in high-level visits, public statements, and outreach to both government officials and civil society in mainland China, Hong Kong, in multilateral fora, and here at home. Canada has consistently called on China to respect, protect, and promote the freedom of opinion and expression, freedom of assembly and association, and freedom of religion or belief of all Chinese citizens.

Canada has a strong interest in a stable and prosperous Hong Kong. We share very strong people-to-people ties, and Hong Kong is an important trade and investment partner for Canada. An estimated 300,000 Canadians reside in Hong Kong, and there are approximately 500,000 people of Hong Kong descent living in Canada. Canada and Hong Kong also share a Commonwealth heritage with a number of values, including the rule of law and freedom of expression, which are essential components of Hong Kong's stability and prosperity. Young people in Hong Kong should not be discouraged from exercising their rights of freedom of expression and peaceful demonstration.

Canada calls for Hong Kong's legal status to be protected.

● (1010)

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for the kind words about Hong Kong, but we do have some specific questions.

The member said that the Government of Canada took note of these cases. Has the Government of Canada specifically discussed the status of Hong Kong and these particular cases with the Government of China? Have statements been made with respect to that?

Could the parliamentary secretary clearly communicate the view of the Government of Canada that these particular sentences are unacceptable, that they go outside of the framework established in Hong Kong's basic law, and that action needs to be taken to address the injustices perpetuated in these cases?

Mr. Matt DeCourcey: Mr. Speaker, as I said earlier, Canadian officials, both on the political side and our tremendous civil servants, always raise our human rights concerns and raise specific cases with our Chinese counterparts at every opportunity. As I said earlier, I have had the chance to do so. My colleague, the parliamentary secretary responsible for consular cases, has done so. The Prime Minister does when he has the opportunity to do so. Members of the government always raise our human rights concerns, as it is a core and fundamental part of our international engagement everywhere we go. Certainly that holds true in our exchanges in our relationship with our Chinese counterparts.

In addition, Canada and Hong Kong share extensive commercial, institutional, and close people-to-people ties. The ability to gather and protest peacefully is a core human right that we believe in, and we see that it must be protected.

Our long-standing position is clear. We support the one country, two systems framework. There are rights guaranteed under Hong Kong's basic law, and Canada will continue to call on China to uphold its international human rights obligations.

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Calgary Shepard is not present to raise the matter for which adjournment notice has been given. Accordingly, the notice is deemed withdrawn.

May I just say before the adjournment and to reiterate comments that were reflected earlier in the debate, it has been a long 12 or so hours, and we all owe a great debt of gratitude to the amazing team that has supported this work in the last 12 hours. They include everyone from our PVOs, sound technicians, interpreters, and the amazing team at the table, to, underneath us in the floor below, a Journals branch, which has to actually transcribe all of the proceedings, and they have to keep up, and will have a great amount of work following this. It has been quite a volume of work.

Thanks to all who have participated and supported this past several hours. I say that on behalf of all our chair occupants, as each of us took a turn.

The motion that the House do now adjourn is deemed to have been adopted. Accordingly, the House stands adjourned until Monday at 11 a.m., pursuant to Standing Order 24(1).

(The House adjourned at 10:13 a.m.)

CONTENTS

Thursday, June 14, 2018

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Business of Supply

Opposition Motion—Carbon Pricing

Motion 21043

Motion negatived 21044

Main Estimates, 2018-19

Concurrence in Vote 1—Northern Pipeline Agency

Motion No. 1 21044

Motion No. 1 agreed to 21045

Concurrence in Vote 1—Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency

Mr. Brison 21045

Motion No. 2 21045

Motion No. 2 agreed to 21046

Concurrence in Vote 1—Canadian Food Inspection Agency

Mr. Brison 21046

Motion No. 3 21046

Motion No. 3 agreed to 21047

Concurrence in Vote 5—Canadian Food Inspection Agency

Mr. Brison 21047

Motion No. 4 21047

Motion No. 4 carried 21049

Concurrence in Vote 1—Canadian Northern Economic Development Agency

Mr. Brison 21049

Motion No. 5 21049

Motion No. 5 agreed to 21050

Concurrence in Vote 5—Canadian Northern Economic Development Agency

Mr. Brison 21050

Motion No. 6 21050

Motion No. 6 agreed to 21051

Concurrence in Vote 1—Economic Development Agency of Canada for the Regions of Quebec

Mr. Brison 21051

Motion No. 7 21051

Motion No. 7 agreed to 21052

Concurrence in Vote 5—Economic Development Agency of Canada for the Regions of Quebec

Mr. Brison 21052

Motion No. 8 21052

Motion No. 8 agreed to 21053

Concurrence in Vote 1—Public Health Agency of Canada

Mr. Brison 21053

Motion No. 9 21053

Motion No. 9 agreed to 21054

Concurrence in Vote 5—Public Health Agency of Canada

Mr. Brison 21054

Motion No. 10 21054

Motion No. 10 agreed to 21056

Concurrence in Vote 10—Public Health Agency of Canada

Mr. Brison 21056

Motion No. 11 21056

Motion No. 11 agreed to 21057

Concurrence in Vote 1—Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency

Mr. Brison 21057

Motion No. 12 21057

Motion No. 12 agreed to 21058

Concurrence in Vote 5—Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency

Mr. Brison 21058

Motion No. 13 21058

Motion No. 13 agreed to 21059

Concurrence in Vote 1—Federal Economic Development Agency for Southern Ontario

Mr. Brison 21059

Motion No. 14 21059

Motion No. 14 agreed to 21060

Concurrence in Vote 5—Federal Economic Development Agency for Southern Ontario

Mr. Brison 21060

Motion No. 15 21060

Motion No. 15 agreed to 21061

Concurrence in Vote 1—Canadian Space Agency

Mr. Brison 21061

Motion No. 16 21061

Motion No. 16 agreed to 21062

Concurrence in Vote 5—Canadian Space Agency

Mr. Brison 21062

Motion No. 17 21062

Motion No. 17 agreed to 21063

Concurrence in Vote 10—Canadian Space Agency

Mr. Brison 21063

Motion No. 18 21063

Motion No. 18 agreed to 21064

Concurrence in Vote 1—Windsor-Detroit Bridge Authority

Mr. Brison 21064

Motion No. 19 21064

Motion No. 19 agreed to 21065

Concurrence in Vote 1—Library of Parliament

Mr. Brison 21066

Motion No. 20 21066

Motion No. 20 agreed to 21067

Concurrence in Vote 1—Library and Archives of Canada

Mr. Brison 21067

Motion No. 21 21067

Motion No. 21 agreed to 21068

Concurrence in Vote 5—Library and Archives of Canada

Mr. Brison 21068

Motion No. 22 ... 21068
Motion No. 22 agreed to ... 21069
Concurrence in Vote 1—Canadian Transportation Accident Investigation and Safety Board
Mr. Brison ... 21069
Motion No. 23 ... 21069
Motion No. 23 agreed to ... 21070
Concurrence in Vote 1—Office of the Correctional Investigator of Canada
Mr. Brison ... 21070
Motion No. 24 ... 21070
Motion No. 24 agreed to ... 21071
Concurrence in Vote 1—Office of Infrastructure of Canada
Mr. Brison ... 21071
Motion No. 25 ... 21071
Motion No. 25 agreed to ... 21072
Concurrence in Vote 5—Office of Infrastructure of Canada
Mr. Brison ... 21072
Motion No. 26 ... 21072
Motion No. 26 agreed to ... 21072
Concurrence in Vote 10—Office of Infrastructure of Canada
Mr. Brison ... 21073
Motion No. 27 ... 21073
Motion No. 27 agreed to ... 21073
Concurrence in Vote 1—Office of the Co-ordinator, Status of Women
Mr. Brison ... 21073
Motion No. 28 ... 21074
Motion No. 28 agreed to ... 21074
Concurrence in Vote 5—Office of the Co-ordinator, Status of Women
Mr. Brison ... 21074
Motion No. 29 ... 21074
Motion No. 29 agreed to ... 21075
Concurrence in Vote 1—Office of the Commissioner for Federal Judicial Affairs
Mr. Brison ... 21075
Motion No. 30 ... 21075
Motion No. 30 agreed to ... 21076
Concurrence in Vote 5—Office of the Commissioner for Federal Judicial Affairs
Mr. Brison ... 21076
Motion No. 31 ... 21076
Motion No. 31 agreed to ... 21077
Concurrence in Vote 1—Office of the Conflict of Interest and Ethics Commissioner
Mr. Brison ... 21077
Motion No. 32 ... 21077
Motion No. 32 agreed to ... 21078
Concurrence in Vote 1—Office of the Communications Security Establishment Commissioner
Mr. Brison ... 21078
Motion No. 33 ... 21078
Motion No. 33 agreed to ... 21079
Vote 1—Privy Council Office
Mr. Brison ... 21079
Motion No. 34 ... 21079
Motion No. 34 agreed to ... 21080
Concurrence in Vote 1—Office of the Senate Ethics Officer
Mr. Sajjan (for the President of the Treasury Board) ... 21080
Motion No. 35 ... 21080
Motion No. 35 agreed to ... 21081
Concurrence in Vote 1—Office of the Director of Public Prosecutions
Mr. Sajjan (for the President of the Treasury Board) ... 21081
Motion No. 36 ... 21081
Motion No. 36 agreed to ... 21082
Concurrence in Vote 1—Office of the Chief Electoral Officer
Mr. Sajjan (for the President of the Treasury Board) ... 21082
Motion No. 37 ... 21082
Motion No. 37 agreed to ... 21083
Concurrence in Vote 1—Office of the Parliamentary Budget Officer
Mr. Sajjan (for the President of the Treasury Board) ... 21083
Motion No. 38 ... 21083
Motion No. 38 agreed to ... 21084
Concurrence in Vote 1—Office of the Secretary to the Governor General
Mr. Sajjan (for the President of the Treasury Board) ... 21084
Motion No. 39 ... 21084
Motion No. 39 agreed to ... 21085
Concurrence in Vote 1—Office of the Superintendent of Financial Institutions
Mr. Sajjan (for the President of the Treasury Board) ... 21085
Motion No. 40 ... 21085
Motion No. 40 agreed to ... 21086
Concurrence in Vote 1—Office of the Auditor General
Mr. Sajjan (for the President of the Treasury Board) ... 21086
Motion No. 41 ... 21086
Motion No. 41 agreed to ... 21087
Vote 1—Canadian Centre for Occupational Health and Safety
Mr. Sajjan (for the President of the Treasury Board) ... 21087
Motion No. 42 ... 21087
Motion No. 42 agreed to ... 21088
Concurrence in Vote 1—Financial Transactions and Reports Analysis Centre of Canada
Mr. Sajjan (for the President of the Treasury Board) ... 21088
Motion No. 43 ... 21088
Motion No. 43 agreed to ... 21089
Concurrence in Vote 1—Communications Security Establishment
Mr. Sajjan (for the President of the Treasury Board) ... 21089
Motion No. 44 ... 21089
Motion No. 44 agreed to ... 21090
Concurrence in Vote 1—International Development Research Centre
Mr. Brison ... 21090
Motion No. 45 ... 21090
Concurrence in Vote 1—House of Commons
Mr. Brison ... 21091
Motion No. 46 ... 21091
Motion No. 46 agreed to ... 21092

Concurrence in Vote 1—Security Intelligence Review Committee
Mr. Brison ... 21092
Motion No. 47 ... 21092
Motion No. 47 agreed to ... 21093
Concurrence in Vote 1—Royal Canadian Mounted Police External Review Committee
Mr. Brison ... 21093
Motion No. 48 ... 21093
Motion No. 48 agreed to ... 21094
Concurrence in Vote 1—Military Grievances External Review Committee
Mr. Brison ... 21094
Motion No. 49 ... 21094
Motion No. 49 agreed to ... 21095
Concurrence in Vote 1—Office of the Public Sector Integrity Commissioner
Mr. Brison ... 21095
Motion No. 50 ... 21095
Motion No. 50 agreed to ... 21096
Concurrence in Vote 1—Office of the Commissioner of Lobbying
Mr. Brison ... 21096
Motion No. 51 ... 21096
Motion No. 51 agreed to ... 21097
Concurrence in Vote 1—Office of the Commissioner of Official Languages
Mr. Brison ... 21097
Motion No. 52 ... 21097
Motion No. 52 agreed to ... 21098
Concurrence in Vote 1—Offices of the Information and Privacy Commissioners of Canada
Mr. Brison ... 21098
Motion No. 53 ... 21098
Motion No. 53 agreed to ... 21099
Concurrence in Vote 5—Offices of the Information and Privacy Commissioners of Canada
Mr. Brison ... 21099
Motion No. 54 ... 21099
Motion No. 54 agreed to ... 21099
Concurrence in Vote 1—Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission
Mr. Brison ... 21100
Motion No. 55 ... 21100
Motion No. 55 agreed to ... 21100
Concurrence in Vote 1—Canadian Human Rights Commission
Mr. Brison ... 21100
Motion No. 56 ... 21100
Motion No. 56 agreed to ... 21101
Concurrence in Vote 1—Canadian Grain Commission
Mr. Brison ... 21101
Motion No. 57 ... 21101
Motion No. 57 agreed to ... 21102
Concurrence in Vote 1—Canadian Dairy Commission
Mr. Brison ... 21102
Motion No. 58 ... 21102
Motion No. 58 agreed to ... 21103
Concurrence in Vote 1—Canadian Tourism Commission
Mr. Brison ... 21103
Motion No. 59 ... 21103
Motion No. 59 agreed to ... 21104
Concurrence in Vote 1—Civilian Review and Complaints Commission for the Royal Canadian Mounted Police
Mr. Brison ... 21104
Motion No. 60 ... 21104
Motion No. 60 agreed to ... 21105
Concurrence in Vote 1—Military Police Complaints Commission
Mr. Brison ... 21105
Motion No. 61 ... 21105
Motion No. 61 agreed to ... 21106
Concurrence in Vote 1—Immigration and Refugee Board
Mr. Brison ... 21106
Motion No. 62 ... 21106
Motion No. 62 agreed to ... 21107
Concurrence in Vote 1—National Capital Commission
Mr. Brison ... 21107
Motion No. 63 ... 21107
Motion No. 63 agreed to ... 21107
Concurrence in Vote 5—National Capital Commission
Mr. Brison ... 21107
Motion No. 64 ... 21107
Motion No. 64 agreed to ... 21108
Concurrence in Vote 1—Public Service Commission
Mr. Brison ... 21108
Motion No. 65 ... 21108
Motion No. 65 agreed to ... 21109
Concurrence in Vote 1—The National Battlefields Commission
Mr. Brison ... 21109
Motion No. 66 ... 21109
Motion No. 66 agreed to ... 21110
Concurrence in Vote 1—Parole Board of Canada
Mr. Brison ... 21110
Motion No. 67 ... 21110
Motion No. 67 agreed to ... 21111
Concurrence in Vote 1—Copyright Board
Mr. Brison ... 21111
Motion No. 68 ... 21111
Motion No. 68 agreed to ... 21112
Concurrence in Vote 1—International Joint Commission (Canadian Section)
Mr. Brison ... 21112
Motion No. 69 ... 21112
Motion No. 69 agreed to ... 21113
Concurrence in Vote 1—Standards Council of Canada
Mr. Brison ... 21113
Motion No. 70 ... 21113
Motion No. 70 agreed to ... 21114
Concurrence in Vote 1—Patented Medicine Prices Review Board
Mr. Brison ... 21114
Motion No. 71 ... 21114

Motion No. 71 agreed to ... 21115
Concurrence in Vote 1—Canadian Radio-television and Telecommunications Commission
Mr. Brison ... 21115
Motion No. 72 ... 21115
Motion No. 72 agreed to ... 21116
Concurrence in Vote 1—Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council
Mr. Brison ... 21116
Motion No. 73 ... 21116
Motion No. 73 agreed to ... 21117
Concurrence in Vote 5—Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council
Mr. Brison ... 21117
Motion No. 74 ... 21117
Motion No. 74 agreed to ... 21117
Concurrence in Vote 1—Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council
Mr. Brison ... 21117
Motion No. 75 ... 21117
Motion No. 75 agreed to ... 21118
Concurrence in Vote 5—Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council
Mr. Brison ... 21118
Motion No. 76 ... 21118
Motion No. 76 agreed to ... 21119
Concurrence in Vote 1—Canada Council for the Arts
Mr. Brison ... 21119
Motion No. 77 ... 21119
Motion No. 77 agreed to ... 21120
Concurrence in Vote 1—National Research Council of Canada
Mr. Brison ... 21120
Motion No. 78 ... 21120
Motion No. 78 agreed to ... 21121
Concurrence in Vote 5—National Research Council of Canada
Mr. Brison ... 21121
Motion No. 79 ... 21121
Motion No. 79 agreed to ... 21122
Concurrence in Vote 10—National Research Council of Canada
Mr. Brison ... 21122
Motion No. 80 ... 21122
Motion No. 80 agreed to ... 21122
Concurrence in Vote 1—Canada School of Public Service
Mr. Brison ... 21123
Motion No. 81 ... 21123
Motion No. 81 agreed to ... 21123
Concurrence in Vote 1—Atomic Energy of Canada Limited
Mr. Brison ... 21123
Motion No. 82 ... 21123
Motion No. 82 agreed to ... 21124
Concurrence in Vote 1—Royal Canadian Mounted Police
Mr. Brison ... 21124
Motion No. 83 ... 21124
Motion No. 83 agreed to ... 21125
Concurrence in Vote 5—Royal Canadian Mounted Police
Ms. Chagger (for the President of the Treasury Board) ... 21125
Motion No. 84 ... 21125
Motion No. 84 agreed to ... 21126
Concurrence in Vote 10—Royal Canadian Mounted Police
Ms. Chagger (for the President of the Treasury Board) ... 21126
Motion No. 85 ... 21126
Motion No. 85 agreed to ... 21127
Concurrence in Vote 1—Canadian Air Transport Security Authority
Ms. Chagger (for the President of the Treasury Board) ... 21127
Motion No. 86 ... 21127
Motion No. 86 agreed to ... 21128
Concurrence in Vote 40—Treasury Board Secretariat
Ms. Chagger (for the President of the Treasury Board) ... 21128
Motion No. 87 ... 21128
Motion No. 87 agreed to ... 21129
Concurrence in Vote 1—Department of Finance
Ms. Chagger (for the President of the Treasury Board) ... 21129
Motion No. 88 ... 21129
Motion No. 88 agreed to ... 21130
Concurrence in Vote 1—Department of Fisheries and Oceans
Ms. Chagger ... 21130
Motion No. 89 ... 21130
Motion No. 89 agreed to ... 21130
Concurrence in Vote 5—Department of Fisheries and Oceans
Ms. Chagger (for the President of the Treasury Board) ... 21131
Motion No. 90 ... 21131
Motion No. 90 agreed to ... 21131
Concurrence in Vote 1—Department of the Environment
Ms. Chagger (for the President of the Treasury Board) ... 21132
Motion No. 91 ... 21132
Motion No. 91 agreed to ... 21132
Concurrence in Vote 5—Department of the Environment
Mr. Brison ... 21132
Motion No. 92 ... 21132
Motion No. 92 agreed to ... 21133
Concurrence in Vote 1—Department of Natural Resources
Mr. Brison ... 21133
Motion No. 93 ... 21133
Motion No. 93 agreed to ... 21134
Concurrence in Vote No. 5—Department of Natural Resources
Mr. Brison ... 21134
Motion No. 94 ... 21134
Motion No. 94 agreed to ... 21135
Concurrence in Vote 1—Department of Justice
Mr. Brison ... 21135
Motion No. 95 ... 21135
Motion No. 95 agreed to ... 21136

Concurrence in Vote 5—Department of Justice
Mr. Brison ... 21136
Motion No. 96 ... 21136
Motion No. 96 agreed to ... 21137
Concurrence in Vote 1—Department of Citizenship and Immigration
Mr. Brison ... 21137
Motion No. 97 ... 21137
Motion No. 97 agreed to ... 21138
Concurrence in Vote 5—Department of Citizenship and Immigration
Mr. Brison ... 21138
Motion No. 98 ... 21138
Motion No. 98 agreed to ... 21139
Concurrence in Vote 1—Department of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness
Mr. Brison ... 21139
Motion. No. 99 ... 21139
Motion No. 99 agreed to ... 21140
Concurrence in Vote 5—Department of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness
Mr. Brison ... 21140
Motion No. 100 ... 21140
Motion No. 100 agreed to ... 21141
Concurrence in Vote 1—Administrative Tribunals Support Service of Canada
Mr. Brison ... 21141
Motion No. 101 ... 21141
Motion No. 101 agreed to ... 21141
Concurrence in Vote 1—Canada Border Services Agency
Mr. Brison ... 21142
Motion No. 102 ... 21142
Motion No. 102 agreed to ... 21142
Concurrence in Vote 5—Canada Border Services Agency
Mr. Brison ... 21142
Motion No. 103 ... 21142
Motion No. 103 agreed to ... 21143
Concurrence in Vote 1—Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation
Mr. Brison ... 21143
Motion No. 104 ... 21143
Motion No. 104 agreed to ... 21144
Concurrence in Vote 1—Canada Post Corporation
Mr. Brison ... 21144
Motion No. 105 ... 21144
Motion No. 105 agreed to ... 21145
Concurrence in Vote 1—Canada Revenue Agency
Mr. Brison ... 21145
Motion No. 106 ... 21145
Motion No. 106 agreed to ... 21146
Concurrence in Vote 5—Canada Revenue Agency
Mr. Brison ... 21146
Motion No. 107 ... 21146
(Motion No. 107 agreed to) ... 21146
Concurrence in Vote 1—Canadian Broadcasting Corporation
Mr. Brison ... 21146
Motion No. 108 ... 21146
(Motion No. 108 agreed to) ... 21147
Concurrence in Vote 5—Canadian Broadcasting Corporation
Mr. Brison ... 21147
Motion No. 109 ... 21147
(Motion No. 109 agreed to) ... 21147
Concurrence in Vote 10—Canadian Broadcasting Corporation
Mr. Brison ... 21147
(Motion No. 110) ... 21147
(Motion No. 110 agreed to) ... 21147
Concurrence in Vote 1—Canadian High Arctic Research Station
Mr. Brison ... 21147
Motion No. 111 ... 21147
(Motion No. 111 agreed to) ... 21147
Mr. Strahl ... 21147
Motion ... 21147
(Motion agreed to) ... 21147
(Motion to concur in the main estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2019, deemed agreed to) ... 21147
(Bill C-80 deemed introduced and read a first time, read a second time, referred to committee of the whole, considered by committee of the whole, reported to the House without amendment, concurred in at report stage, read a third time, and passed) ... 21147

ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS

Foreign Affairs
Mr. Genuis ... 21147
Mr. DeCourcey ... 21148

Published under the authority of the Speaker of the House of Commons

SPEAKER'S PERMISSION

The proceedings of the House of Commons and its Committees are hereby made available to provide greater public access. The parliamentary privilege of the House of Commons to control the publication and broadcast of the proceedings of the House of Commons and its Committees is nonetheless reserved. All copyrights therein are also reserved.

Reproduction of the proceedings of the House of Commons and its Committees, in whole or in part and in any medium, is hereby permitted provided that the reproduction is accurate and is not presented as official. This permission does not extend to reproduction, distribution or use for commercial purpose of financial gain. Reproduction or use outside this permission or without authorization may be treated as copyright infringement in accordance with the *Copyright Act*. Authorization may be obtained on written application to the Office of the Speaker of the House of Commons.

Reproduction in accordance with this permission does not constitute publication under the authority of the House of Commons. The absolute privilege that applies to the proceedings of the House of Commons does not extend to these permitted reproductions. Where a reproduction includes briefs to a Committee of the House of Commons, authorization for reproduction may be required from the authors in accordance with the *Copyright Act*.

Nothing in this permission abrogates or derogates from the privileges, powers, immunities and rights of the House of Commons and its Committees. For greater certainty, this permission does not affect the prohibition against impeaching or questioning the proceedings of the House of Commons in courts or otherwise. The House of Commons retains the right and privilege to find users in contempt of Parliament if a reproduction or use is not in accordance with this permission.

Also available on the House of Commons website at the following address: http://www.ourcommons.ca

Publié en conformité de l'autorité du Président de la Chambre des communes

PERMISSION DU PRÉSIDENT

Les délibérations de la Chambre des communes et de ses comités sont mises à la disposition du public pour mieux le renseigner. La Chambre conserve néanmoins son privilège parlementaire de contrôler la publication et la diffusion des délibérations et elle possède tous les droits d'auteur sur celles-ci.

Il est permis de reproduire les délibérations de la Chambre et de ses comités, en tout ou en partie, sur n'importe quel support, pourvu que la reproduction soit exacte et qu'elle ne soit pas présentée comme version officielle. Il n'est toutefois pas permis de reproduire, de distribuer ou d'utiliser les délibérations à des fins commerciales visant la réalisation d'un profit financier. Toute reproduction ou utilisation non permise ou non formellement autorisée peut être considérée comme une violation du droit d'auteur aux termes de la *Loi sur le droit d'auteur*. Une autorisation formelle peut être obtenue sur présentation d'une demande écrite au Bureau du Président de la Chambre.

La reproduction conforme à la présente permission ne constitue pas une publication sous l'autorité de la Chambre. Le privilège absolu qui s'applique aux délibérations de la Chambre ne s'étend pas aux reproductions permises. Lorsqu'une reproduction comprend des mémoires présentés à un comité de la Chambre, il peut être nécessaire d'obtenir de leurs auteurs l'autorisation de les reproduire, conformément à la *Loi sur le droit d'auteur*.

La présente permission ne porte pas atteinte aux privilèges, pouvoirs, immunités et droits de la Chambre et de ses comités. Il est entendu que cette permission ne touche pas l'interdiction de contester ou de mettre en cause les délibérations de la Chambre devant les tribunaux ou autrement. La Chambre conserve le droit et le privilège de déclarer l'utilisateur coupable d'outrage au Parlement lorsque la reproduction ou l'utilisation n'est pas conforme à la présente permission.

Aussi disponible sur le site Web de la Chambre des communes à l'adresse suivante : http://www.noscommunes.ca